

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE HAPSBURG MONARCHY
THROUGH THIRTY YEARS
THE REAL STANLEY BALDWIN

HITLER

WHENCE AND WHITHER?

BY

WICKHAM STEED

LECTURER IN CENTRAL EUROPEAN HISTORY AT
KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON



LONDON: NISBET AND CO., LTD.
22 BERNERS STREET, W. 1

First Published in 1934
Reprinted January 1934
Reprinted February 1934
Reprinted April 1934

Printed in Great Britain by
UNWIN BROTHERS LIMITED, LONDON AND WOKING

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

THE favour shown to this little book by the Press and public necessitates a third edition. In it no changes have been made beyond the correction of some technical oversights. But I take this opportunity gratefully to acknowledge the kindness of many critics, and to rectify some misleading comments by others.

Not all readers, I imagine, will agree with the writer in a Northern journal who charges me with having drawn a "ferocious portrait" of Herr Hitler. Would he have had me paint the author of *Mein Kampf*, whose favourite adjective is "brutal," as a sucking dove? In the organ of the Society of Friends a distinguished Quaker says I seem to be "a man who goes about the world with one eye very wide open and the other tight shut." He has perhaps failed to reflect that, proverbially, the one-eyed man is not without honour in the country of the blind.

"Nothing but a real change in us, nothing but faith in German goodwill—a faith showing itself in deeds—can reassure the German people," he adds. May I advise him to study

the effects of British faith in German goodwill—a faith shown by deeds during 1912, 1913, and June 1914—in Nos. 9966 and 10215 of the Austro-Hungarian Diplomatic Documents? There he may see that British faith in German goodwill moved Germany to urge Austria-Hungary to make war because British neutrality was thought to be certain; and further enquiry will show him that Germany took steps to tender this advice not only after, but before, the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914.

None are so blind as those who will not see. I should be sorry to number among the wilfully blind so eminent a writer as "F. A. V." in the *Manchester Guardian*. He, like the distinguished Quaker aforesaid, taxes me with telling "only one side of the truth" and of ignoring the evil effects of the Versailles Treaty. Before denouncing the Versailles Treaty it is well to read it. To assume that "F. A. V." has not read it is the kindest construction to place upon his statement that "Article 231 of the Peace Treaty, which, by implication, makes the Germans alone responsible for the War, was a humiliating insult to a great people."

The truth is that Article 231 contains no insult to the German people, nor does it make them alone responsible for the War. It was

drawn, and Germany was required to accept it, as a legal statement of claim for damage caused to the "Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals . . . as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies." The aggression of Germany and her allies is a fact, not a matter of opinion. Austria-Hungary was under no compulsion to attack Serbia, nor was Germany compelled to invade Belgium. Without these acts of aggression there would have been no war, and no damage or claim for reparations.

The subsequent mismanagement of the reparations problem, and the gradual "revision" in favour of Germany of the reparations claim, are quite distinct from the wording of Article 231. The point is that the campaign of German propaganda against the so-called "war-guilt lie"—a campaign which, with its echoes in Great Britain and other countries fostered the rise of Hitlerism—was directed against Article 231 in order that Germany might escape the payment of reparations. Had its object been moral this German effort would have been concentrated against Articles 227-230 of the Versailles Treaty, the real "war-guilt" articles, which refer to "criminal acts, and arraign "William II of Hohenzollern formerly German Emperor, for a supren

PREFACE

offence against international morality and the sanctity of treaties.”

But German propaganda ignored these Articles, and the Allies made no serious attempt to enforce them. Article 231 was singled out for attack and deliberately misinterpreted as a pretext under which the whole Peace Settlement could be discredited. Yet, as the dupes of this propaganda may perceive when it is too late, the Peace Settlement, despite its many imperfections, represents the soundest territorial order that has existed in Europe since the principle of nationality was affirmed.

If in this and some other respects—notably the pro-German propaganda carried on before, during, and after the War by Jews of German origin who were no longer citizens of Germany—what I have written on Hitlerism can be assailed only by misstatements or deductions from unsound premises, it would seem to stand on firmer ground than I imagined.

W. S.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface to the Third Edition	v
Introduction	xi
<small>CHAPTER</small>	
I. The Nordic Legend	3
II. Hitler and the Nazi Movement	41
III. Mass Suggestion and Persecution Mania	75
IV. Germanism and Jewry	111
V. The Third Empire and the Totali- tarian State	151

INTRODUCTION

MANY hearers who took interest in a course of public lectures on "Hitlerism" which I gave last autumn at King's College, London, have asked me to publish them. Hence this little volume. As a rule, lectures are better heard than read. This is why I have rarely put into print the courses which, during the past few years, I have given at King's College in my capacity as "Lecturer on Central European History with especial reference to Roumania and the Near East." Sometimes it has happened that the subjects of such lectures have been chosen, months beforehand, without a thought that, when the time should come to deliver them, circumstances would conspire to make them topical and almost controversial. This was the case in the autumn of 1932 when I spoke upon the first two volumes of the late Dr. Stresemann's *Testament* and on the events that led up to the Treaties of Locarno. But in the present instance I cannot claim inadvertence. From the moment President Hindenburg entrusted the German Chancellorship to the National Socialist (or Nazi) leader, Herr Adolf Hitler

INTRODUCTION

on January 30, 1933, it was clear that the whole position in Central and South-Eastern Europe would be affected and that many underlying tendencies, hitherto hidden or masked, would reveal themselves. Therefore it seemed fitting that my University lectures, which have always dealt with historical developments in the light of present conditions, or with present conditions in the light of history, should treat frankly of the antecedents of Hitlerism. When a movement and a doctrine had taken so firm a hold upon a great Central European people as the Hitlerite movement and doctrine have gained upon the German nation, there was good warrant for enquiring fearlessly into their origins and their character.

The political effects of the advent of Hitlerism upon Central Europe, even outside Germany, are already striking. Soviet Russia, Poland, and the members of the Little Entente have drawn closer together, as though impelled by a common sense of danger. In pacts of non-aggression between Russia and her neighbours, aggression has been defined in such fashion as to cover every form of hostile action. Dislike of Hitlerite pressure upon Austria has so affected Italy that even Italian Fascism can no longer be thought an unqualified

INTRODUCTION

supporter of the Third German Reich. As an indirect consequence Italian relations with France have improved, as have relations between Paris and Moscow. Over the whole region from the Baltic to the Adriatic, and from the North to the Black Seas, Hitlerism has written a large note of interrogation. Even Great Britain has not escaped its influence. Indeed, its bearing upon British interests, and its threat to the peace of Europe and of the world, may change profoundly the British outlook both upon foreign affairs in general and upon the security of these Islands.

In these circumstances the study of Hitlerism appeared to me a matter of some moment. Since Hitler himself is a product of Austrian conditions in the decade before the War, and since those were conditions which, as correspondent of *The Times* in Austria-Hungary, I then lived under and observed, it seemed expedient that I should attempt to analyse both Hitler's own mind and the peculiar mental quality which he imparted to his movement. Very few Englishmen went through the Austrian mill at that time as I went through it. For this reason I am perhaps in a better position than that of other observers to understand the background of Hitlerism. This was

...

INTRODUCTION

an additional reason for not withholding my personal testimony from the students at King's College.

A word of warning may be due to those who care to look into these pages. Hitlerism, either as a doctrine or as a movement, is incomprehensible without knowledge of what I have termed "The Nordic Legend." This legend or, as some might prefer to call it, this strange evangel, is in its turn the fruit of semi-philosophical and professedly historical works by Count Alexandre de Gobineau and Houston Stewart Chamberlain, which were written in the middle and towards the end of the nineteenth century. An account of these works was therefore indispensable. Should readers find the first chapter on "The Nordic Legend" somewhat more abstract in style and treatment than others which speak of Hitlerism in being, those who have the patience to look through it may feel that their effort has not been wholly wasted.

Of the inadequacy of these pages as an exhaustive account of Hitlerism none can be more conscious than I am. They are meant to serve rather as an introduction to the study of one of the most remarkable phenomena of modern times than as a full description of it.

INTRODUCTION

Yet they contain, I believe, the essence of Hitlerism as it has hitherto developed. If they give greater prominence to its philosophical and political than to its economic features, it is because its economics are still nebulous, whereas its political features are abundantly clear. Nor have I dwelt upon the "atrocities" which accompanied the Hitlerite revolution in the spring of last year. They may be taken for granted and are sufficiently known. No amount of denial or palliation can explain them away. But my purpose was not to arouse indignation. Rather was it to promote understanding. So I have sought to explain both the nature of Hitlerism and its challenge to the ideas and institutions which form the basis of our Western liberal civilisation.

.

THE NORDIC LEGEND

CHAPTER I

THE NORDIC LEGEND

WHAT is Hitlerism? Its essence is "The Nordic Legend" which true believers in it look upon as a redeeming evangel. Hitler did not invent it, though he has used it to surround his movement with a mystical atmosphere of race superiority which goes some way to explain its charm for the German people. He found it, indeed, present in most German hearts and imaginations; and inasmuch as its appeal is to the self-esteem of the Germanic "tribes" they succumbed the more readily to his forceful presentation of it.

The chief exponent, if not the "onlie begetter," of the Nordic legend was a French diplomatist and man of letters, Count Alexandre de Gobineau who, in the 'fifties of last century, published two volumes upon *The Inequality of Human Races*. Then, successively or simultaneously, Nietzsche and Richard Wagner, each in their several ways and sometimes in strife with one another, helped to spread it. Their works, and particularly Wagner's operas, carried the vague metaphysics of it throughout

the greater part of the world, though nowhere save in Germany did these metaphysics, set to music in a way that fomented nervous and aesthetic excitement, become a kind of national religion. Yet neither Wagner nor Nietzsche would have been likely to transform the Nordic legend into a political programme had not a Germanised Briton, named Houston Stewart Chamberlain, expatiated upon it, with a great show and some reality of crudition, in his famous work *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* which appeared in 1899.

With Gobineau's theory, and with Chamberlain's expansion of it, I have long been familiar. Since the advent of Hitlerism I have, however, ploughed once again through Gobineau's closely printed volumes and have likewise re-read Chamberlain's work. In so far as it is possible to disentangle the main arguments of these discursive works from their literary trappings, I shall try to set them forth, not without warning others that should they, too, venture into the thickets of so formidable a jungle they may imperil their mental composure.

Count Alexandre de Gobineau was born on July 14, 1816, in Paris, and died at Turin in October 1882. He himself would certainly have

preferred some other birthday to the thirty-seventh anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, for he was the son of an officer in Louis XVIII's Royal Guard and a descendant of the great Norman family, de Gournay, which had established itself in Guyenne as far back as the fourteenth century. Hence, perhaps, the vanity which, in later years, led Gobineau to work out for himself a genealogical tree to prove his descent from the Scandinavian Vikings.

Gobineau's early years were passed in or near Paris, but at the age of twelve he was sent to school in Switzerland where he learned German and began to reflect upon questions of race. Returning to live with his father in Brittany he was surrounded by an atmosphere of provincial Bourbon legitimism which left its mark upon him. Presently he made his way again to Paris. There he became intimate with de Tocqueville, and was chosen as chief Private Secretary when de Tocqueville took over the French Foreign Office in 1848. The hostility of Louis Napoleon soon drove de Tocqueville from power, and Gobineau was given a minor appointment at the French Embassy at Berne. Here he began his work on *The Inequality of Human Races* and completed it in the French Legations at Hanover and

Frankfurt to which he was subsequently transferred. At Frankfurt he made the acquaintance both of Bismarck and of one of Metternich's chief disciples, Baron von Prokesch, keeping in constant touch with the latter even after being sent, in 1854, to Teheran as First Secretary of the French Legation. There he learned Persian thoroughly and cultivated the society of Persian writers and philosophers. His diplomatic career afterwards took him, as Minister, to Greece, Brazil, and Sweden. In Brazil the last Emperor, Dom Pedro, sought his friendship and made of him a trusted companion. Gobineau's career ended in 1877 when, by a series of misfortunes, he found himself reduced almost to penury. Five years later he died in Italy.

Though Gobineau wrote and published many works that established his claim to philosophical and literary distinction, the chief pillar of his—mainly posthumous—fame is his work on *The Inequality of Human Races*. Briefly, its thesis is this:—

The old idea that societies and civilisations perish only through fanaticism, luxurious effeminacy, and vice cannot be historically upheld. Peoples die of degeneration, that is to say, of contempt for ethnical principles, and

through interbreeding. Some races are natural rulers, but their numbers are small and they tend to be absorbed and submerged by the peoples over which they rule. Whether or not the human race sprang from a single original stock, racial differences are now permanent. Nor is ethnical inequality a result of institutions or of climatic surroundings. The character of peoples is independent of the countries they inhabit. The racial characteristics of Arabs and Jews, for instance, have not changed under the influence of other climates. Races are intellectually unequal, and human beings are not susceptible of infinite perfectibility. The influence of religion upon them should not be overestimated. Christianity did not create and has not changed racial aptitudes for civilisation. Christianity is a civilising force in so far as it renders men more gentle and more thoughtful, but our civilisation is not superior to the civilisations which preceded it.

In the human scale the Melanesian race is the lowest, the Yellow race stands second, and the White race first, the Aryans having been the progenitors of the White race. In the fifth century of our era the rise and spread of the Aryan Germanic races changed the character of Western peoples.

The appearance of the Aryan race in history begins with the conquest of Babylon by the Medes, who were but a small fraction of that race. They ousted the Hamites and the Semites from the prominent positions which those races had held. For many centuries the Medes had preserved their national language, a derivative of the original White language; and, thanks to their physical type, were not in danger of being confounded with the black or coloured peoples. The Aryans, long before their arrival in India, were distinct from the other races which were also destined to become European. The name "Aryan" means "honourable," and Aryan nations were composed of "honourable men." The ancient Hindus called their sacred country *Arya-Varta*—the country of honourable men. A similar notion was common to the Persians and the Greeks. Among the high-caste Hindus the idea of beauty is inseparable from whiteness; and caste, or *varna*, was also founded upon degrees of whiteness.

The essential characteristics of races are those of the abilities they possess and develop. If the Aryan has not always been the best of men from the standpoint of practical morality, he is at least the most enlightened upon the

intrinsic worth of what he does. When he is in a tight place his heart may be as hard as his armour; and if he is hard towards himself it is not astonishing that he should be pitiless towards others. His merit consists in his loyal acceptance of a law that may be ferocious but grows milder in proportion as conditions may permit.

It is mainly by reason of his intelligence and vigour that the Aryan is superior to other men; and it is thanks to these two qualities that he is capable, when he succeeds in conquering his passions and in providing for his material needs, of reaching a very high level of morality, even though he may be guilty, in other circumstances, of as many reprehensible acts as the individual members of inferior races.

The Germanic Aryan is a powerful and superior creature. All that he believes, all that he says, and all that he does become matters of major importance. True to his ancestry the Germanic Aryan, on his arrival in Europe, had not lost the habit of attributing his origin to the gods; and just as the Greeks, who were Aryans, traced their descent from Jupiter and from Neptune, the Scandinavian Aryans traced their descent from Odin.

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

This short summary of Gobineau's theory, or affirmations, can convey no idea of the tangled mass from which I have sought to extract it. What is clear in it is the apotheosis of the "Nordic" Aryans and the rehabilitation of Scandinavian and Germanic mythology. For many years it attracted little attention in France; perhaps because Gobineau, while continuing to serve the French Republic as its diplomatic representative at Stockholm until 1877, had little love for the Republican form of government and still less for the democratic principles upon which it was based. He looked upon himself as more Norman than French, and more "Germanic Aryan," or Scandinavian, than either; and in 1879 he wrote to Prince Eulenberg, a Prussian magnate who had referred to France as Gobineau's "Fatherland": "Your remark about my Fatherland amuses me. Tell me, please, what the word means, whether at bottom it means anything more than M. Gambetta, the Republic, the Orleanists, the Imperialists, the Democrats of all sorts, and the single thought of making money? No, no. I come from elsewhere and I think as people think elsewhere." Gobineau's real patriotism was his belief in the superiority of an ideal Germanic Aryan Fatherland.

THE NORDIC LEGEND

In these circumstances it is explicable that Gobineau's works should have been translated into German and widely read. As late as 1925 edition after edition of them continued to pour from German presses. So strong was their influence in persuading the Germans of Germany that they are a race of rulers, born to overlordship, that one of Gobineau's French disciples, Vacher de Lapouge, became uneasy and published in 1909 a warning that political mountebanks like Houston Stewart Chamberlain had drawn and would draw from Gobineau theories "which have become the foundations of German Imperialism, the most aggressive that exists, and the creed of tens of millions of Germans in the Empire, in Austria, Switzerland, and America." These theories, Lapouge added, "are becoming a danger to the world and are making increasingly perilous the tension between Germany and the non-German peoples. . . . They will not be got rid of by ignoring the force of an idea so powerful as that of the Aryan mission in the world." Yet it is from this same French writer, Vacher de Lapouge, that Hitler and his comrades have taken not a few of their ideas, especially that of the sterilisation of individuals whose undesirable

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?
characteristics may imperil the purity of the
"Nordic" race.

* * *

Vacher de Lapouge called Houston Stewart Chamberlain a "political mountebank." Far be it from me to use so harsh a term, for he is one of the gods of Adolf Hitler, and Hitler is the trusted leader, or *Führer*, of Germany. Chamberlain was born at Southsea in 1855, as the son of Admiral William Charles Chamberlain. Two of his uncles were British Generals and a third was Field-Marshal Sir Neville Chamberlain. His education was mainly foreign. It began at Versailles in a French secondary school, though he was intended for the British Army. Weak health prevented him from following a military career; and, after a period under a German tutor who seems to have had great influence over him, young Chamberlain went to Geneva where he studied botany, geology, astronomy, and, later, anatomy and physiology. Once more his health broke down and he went to Dresden where he came under the spell of Wagner's music and metaphysics. Having learnt German thoroughly he began to write in that language, mainly upon Wagner, of whom he published

a biography and whose daughter he afterwards married. Though in 1897 he produced a botanical work in French, German had become his favourite language by 1892; and it was in German that he wrote his *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* in 1899, and his *Aryan Outlook* in 1911. He died in January 1927, having become a naturalised German during the War.

In Chamberlain thousands of Germans found a philosopher and guide after their own hearts. They hailed him as a great German scholar. The famous British Hellenist, Porson, said long ago: "German scholars dive deeper and come up muddier than any others." By comparison with Chamberlain's jumble of semi-erudite metaphysics, even Gobineau is pellucid and coherent—though Chamberlain denounces Gobineau's acceptance of the notion that the world was peopled by the offspring of Shem, Ham, and Japhet as a lapse of judgment which suffices to make of the *Inequality of Human Races* a scientific phantasmagoria. Nevertheless I must essay to give a not wholly unintelligible account of Chamberlain's own phantasmagoria, if only because it supplies the key to much Hitlerite doctrine and, in part, to Hitlerism itself.

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

The late Lord Redesdale, who wrote a long Introduction to the English edition of *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, summed up Chamberlain's thesis as a demonstration that the first place in the world belongs to the Teutonic branch of the Aryan family, and that the story of the nineteenth century is the story of the Teuton's triumph. Chamberlain himself says that by "Teutonic peoples" he understands the various races of Northern Europe which appear in history as Celts, Teutons (that is to say the Germanic peoples in general), and Slavs, from whom, mostly by intermingling, the peoples of modern Europe are descended.

Here we have the Northern or Nordic evangel in germ. Chamberlain believes it certain that the Teutonic peoples originally belonged to a single family, though the Teuton, in the narrower sense of the word, has proved himself so pre-eminent as to make his name represent the whole family. The Teuton, he declares, is the soul of our culture. Europe today (he was writing at the end of the nineteenth century) represents the result of an infinite mingling of races; what binds them all together and makes an organic unity of them is Teutonic blood. Only Teutons sit on the thrones of Europe. True history begins

at the moment when the Teuton, with his masterful hand, lays his grip on the legacy of antiquity.

In these assertions the influence of Gobineau is evident. Still clearer is it in Chamberlain's subsequent affirmation that it was the entrance of the Germanic peoples into history that saved Europe and mankind. Among these Germanic peoples, he insists, the Celts must be included. The very word "Germanic" is Celtic. The great majority of the Slavs were also of Germanic origin. As a rule that man only is Germanic who is descended from Germanic ancestors. Germanism lies in the blood. Goethe declares that it was the Germanic races who first introduced into the world the idea of personal freedom.

* * *

In view of the present denials of personal freedom by Hitlerism, and of the doctrine that individual lives and liberties belong to and depend upon the State alone, it is of interest to note that Chamberlain assigns great historical importance in the development of Germanic ideas to Magna Carta and to the sturdy defence of individual rights in England. He quotes from Magna Carta the passage:

"No one may be condemned except in accordance with the laws of the land. Right and justice may not be bought nor refused"; and he adds: "In some countries of Europe this first guarantee of the dignity of man has not to this day become law; but since that 15th of June, 1215, a general law of conscience has gradually grown out of it, and whoever runs counter to this is a criminal, even if he wear a crown."

Thus Houston Stewart Chamberlain, were he still alive, would be a strong candidate for internment in a Nazi concentration camp. A doctrine more reprehensible than this, from the Nazi point of view, can hardly be imagined. He might even be accused of looking upon the Jews as "men" possessing "the dignity of man"; for there are passages in his own introductory chapter that would kindle the ire of every true-born, blue-eyed, Nordic German Antisemitic. He writes, in fact: "I have become convinced that the usual treatment of the 'Jewish question' is altogether and always superficial; the Jew is no enemy of Teutonic civilisation and culture; Herder may be right in his assertion that the Jew is always alien to us, and consequently we to him, and no one will deny that this is to the detriment of our

work and culture; yet I think we are inclined to underestimate our own powers in this respect, and on the other, to exaggerate the importance of the Jewish influence. Hand in hand with this goes the perfectly ridiculous and revolting tendency to make the Jews the general scapegoat for all the vices of our time. In reality the 'Jewish peril' lies much deeper; the Jew is not responsible for it; we have given rise to it ourselves and must overcome it ourselves. . . . It is because of the lack of a true religion that our whole Teutonic culture is sick unto death. . . . No people in the world is so beggarly-poor in religion as are the Semites and their half-brothers, the Jews."

* * *

Chamberlain's mind was, in reality, governed by the idea of finding a "true religion" for the Germanic peoples. His book *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* was far less a political than a metaphysico-religious essay, with the notion of race-purity running through it. For the personality and the teachings of Christ he professes the utmost reverence, perhaps because, as will presently appear, he doubts whether the parents of Christ were of Jewish

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

or even of Semitic blood, despite their orthodox Jewish faith.

Here is a summary of many hundreds of his discursive pages:—

Out of the chaos of peoples that arose after the collapse of the Roman Empire, the Jews—a single people, numerically insignificant—towered like a sharply-defined rock amid the formless ocean. This one race established purity of blood as its guiding principle, and it alone possessed physiognomy and character. However poor the Jewish “Law” may appear when compared with the religious creations of the various European peoples, it possessed a unique advantage amid the ruins of the fallen Roman Empire of that time. It was in fact a Law, which men humbly obeyed, and this very obedience was bound to be of great ethical importance in a world of lawlessness. The influence of the Jews, for good and for evil, lies in their character, not in their intellectual achievements. Gobineau’s view that Judaism has always had a disintegrating influence upon all peoples cannot be sustained, for Judaism, as an idea, is one of the most conservative ideas in the world. Its very essence is physical race-unity and race-purity, and this implies recognition of a fundamental physiological fact.

Judaism hallowed this law of nature; and this is why it triumphantly prevailed at that critical moment in the history of the world. It did not increase, rather did it check, universal disintegration. Instead of being indignant we shall do better to inform ourselves thoroughly about the significance of this "entrance of the Jews into the history of the West," an event which in any case exercised immeasurable influence upon our whole culture—an influence that is still growing.

These principles, Chamberlain insists, apply to Jews only, not to Semites in general; for though the Semites—Phoenicians, Arabs, and others—have played a great part in the history of the world, there was nowhere a close intellectual connection between them and the other inhabitants of future Europe. The Jews first established this connection, not by the millions of them who lived in the Diaspora, or Dispersion, but first and foremost by the Christian idea. It was only when the Jews crucified Christ that they unconsciously broke the spell which had, until then, isolated them in the pride of ignorance.

To this entrance of the Jews into the history of the West, Chamberlain goes on, there is one great counterpart—the entrance of the Teu-

tonic races into the history of the world. Here, too, we see what pure race signifies. These two powers—the Jewish race and the Teutonic races—stand face to face as forces now friendly, now hostile, but always as alien to each other. Whence came the Teutonic peoples? The theory of the immigration of the so-called Indo-European from Asia rests on very slender grounds. Investigators are finding more and more that the population which we are accustomed to call Indo-European was settled in Europe from time immemorial. Yet nothing is so convincing as the consciousness of race. Race lifts a man above himself. The history of Rome teaches this lesson. Disraeli taught it likewise, namely, that the whole significance of Judaism lies in its purity of race. The case of the English is significant. The great difference between Calais and Dover reveals the distinction between the French and the English races, despite their many points of relationship. The English racial character is also an effect of purer inbreeding, for England is practically cut off by her insular position. The last, not very extensive, invasion of England took place eight hundred years ago. Since then only a few thousands from the Netherlands and, later, a few thousand Huguenots (all of the same

racial origin) have crossed to England, and thus has been reared the race which is now unquestionably the strongest in Europe.

So with the Sephardic or Spanish Jews, and the Ashkenazim or so-called German Jews. The type of the former is Semitic in the same sense as that of certain noble Syrians and Arabs. The Sephardic Jews may not have been Judaeans by blood at all; and the shrewd Romans transported nearly all these proud men, many of whom were dangerously fanatic, from their Eastern home to the farthest West. If the poorest of the Sephardim from Salonica be compared with any Ashkenazim financier, the difference between the nobility conferred by race and that conferred by wealth, or by a monarch, becomes apparent.

According to Herder (the German philosopher with whom Chamberlain does not always agree) the Jewish people is and remains in Europe an Asiatic people alien to our part of the world, bound to that old Law which it received in a distant climate, a Law which, by their own confession, the Jews cannot do away with. But, Chamberlain goes on, this alien people became, in the course of the nineteenth century, disproportionately influential in many spheres of life. The possession

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

of money is not, in itself, of the greatest account. More important is it that European Governments, law, science, trade, literature, and art came to be largely dominated by the Jews. The Indo-European, moved by ideal motives, opened his gates in friendship. The Jew rushed in like an enemy, stormed all positions and planted the flag of his alien nature on the breaches of genuine Teutonic individuality.

Chamberlain claims, however, that it would be unworthy and senseless to revile the Jews for this reason. They acted with absolute consistency, according to their own logic and truth. Even Renan (whom Chamberlain regards as pro-Jewish) he quotes as saying: "I am the first to recognise that the Semitic race, as compared to the Indo-European race, really represents an inferior combination of human nature." Chamberlain is also careful not to overlook the famous passage in Renan's inaugural lecture "On the Part Played by Semitic Peoples in the History of Civilisation," in which Renan defines Islam as an expression of the "terrible simplicity of the Semitic mind, a simplicity that shrinks the human brain, closes it to every delicate idea, to every refinement of feeling, and to all rational research in order to bring it

face to face with an eternal tautology: God is God."

* * *

Having thus laid the foundations for his analysis of the Jewish spirit, Chamberlain proceeds to what is in effect a historical or pseudo-historical indictment of the Jews and Judaism. In the second century, he relates, the Jews on the island of Cyprus were so numerous that they determined to set up a national State of their own and, following Old Testament procedure, slew in one day all the other inhabitants, 240,000 in number. Wherever they flourished their aim was to get all the intellectual and material control of the State into their own hands. They held high positions not only among the Moors of Spain but under the Babenberg Princes of Austria as early as the thirteenth century, and at the Court of Pope Innocent III. But they lacked shrewdness and moderation, and were ultimately ousted. Frederick II of Hohenstauffen and Frederick II of Hohenzollern alike debarred the Jews from holding power. A man as enlightened as Goethe asks how it is possible to let the Jews share our highest culture when they deny its origin and source. Yet for nine-

teen centuries the Jews have had an inner as well as an outer contact with our culture. Indeed, as Kant remarks, the preservation of Judaism is primarily the work of Christianity. From the midst of Judaism, if not from its spirit, Christ and the earliest members of the Christian Church arose. Christ and His parents, Chamberlain argues, were probably of non-Jewish blood though Jews by religion, because Galilee, from which they came, was recognised by the Jews as a country of Gentiles and was peopled by a mixed non-Jewish race which had adopted the Jewish religion. Nobody can say what a Semite is any more than what an Aryan is. These are mere names for what were once original races. But race, as we know it, is not an original phenomenon. It is produced physiologically by cross-breeding followed by inbreeding, and psychically by the influence which long-lasting historical and geographical conditions exercise upon that special physiological foundation.

Chamberlain draws a sharp distinction between the Israelites and the Jews. The Jew, he claims, only began to develop when the more powerful tribes of the Israelite North had been destroyed by the Assyrians. The specifically Jewish character was artificially

brought into the Bible after the Babylonian captivity, whole Books being invented and ascribed to Moses, and verse after verse of matter being interpolated to replace the wider views of old Israel by the narrow Judæan and Jerusalemic cult of Jehovah. The Israelites probably sprang from the crossing of three or four human strains—the Semitic, the Syrian or Hittite, the Indo-European, and possibly the Turanian. In Syria the breed was changed by intermarriage with an absolutely different type, the Syrian, and became known as Hebrews. The so-called Jewish nose is a Hittite legacy. The Israelites did not conquer the people of Canaan systematically but made their way among them, and the Israelites in the era of the Kings had a strong Canaanite strain in their blood. Their gods were at once Canaanite and Jewish, Baal, the god of agriculture and peaceful work, sharing allegiance with Jehovah, the god of armies and raids. King David's bodyguard was largely composed of Hittites, many of his most valuable soldiers were also Gittites (a savage and pure-blooded Aryan tribe), and David himself won the throne with the help of the Philistines, probably as their vassal. He married women of Syrian and Indo-European blood and may himself

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

have been half or three-quarters Amorite. King Solomon could hardly be called an Israelite, for it is very unlikely that his mother, Bath-Sheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite, was herself an Israelite. Chamberlain thinks that the short period of splendour in the history of the people of Israel which was marked by the reigns of David and Solomon may have been nothing more than an episode brought about by the strength of men who were mainly or entirely of non-Jewish blood.

Ezekiel, Chamberlain asserts further, was the real inventor of Judaism. He rebuked the Israelites for mixing with Amorites and Hittites. In order to wipe out the irretrievable past and to create a Jewish people, the whole of Jewish history had to be falsified from the beginning, the Jews being represented as a people chosen by God, and of a stainless race-purity which had to be protected against cross-breeding by stringent laws. After the Babylonian captivity the victory of the religious party, that is to say, of the Jewish party, was unquestionably a victory for the Semitic element. The typical Jew took no interest in politics, literature, philosophy, or art. The Law formed his whole literature, and its study was his sole intellectual exercise. In his religion

the Semite is selfish and exclusive. Tolerance, as a result of greater freedom of thought, is most pronounced among the Indo-Teutonic peoples. The predominant power in the soul of the Semite is his will. The Jews have no metaphysics but only an intense religion in which there is no inner mystery. It represents a minimum of religion. Moses Mendelssohn, says Chamberlain, wrote truly: "Judaism is not revealed religion but revealed legislation." The Sanskrit word for the highest and only God is, on the contrary, "Brahma," meaning "Prayer." This is the real difference between Semitic and Aryan conceptions of religion.

From Israel itself, Chamberlain avers, Judaism could never have sprung. The real Jew only developed in the course of centuries by gradual physical separation from the Israelite family and also by the progressive development of some mental qualities and the systematic starving of others. He is not the result of a normal national life but is, so to speak, an artificial product—the product of a priestly caste which forced upon an unwilling people a priestly legislation and a priestly faith as having been given by God.

If the Assyrians had invaded Judaea and had scattered the inhabitants, the Judaeans

would have vanished as completely as the Israelites, but Sennacherib—Chamberlain regrets to say—attacked them too late and was obliged to desist and to withdraw by pestilence and dissension. That day the Jew was born, and with him the Jehovah we know from the Bible. The country had to be cleared of strange gods, and the idea was proclaimed that Jehovah could only be worshipped in Jerusalem. The books of the Law were “found,” that is to say, drawn up with a purpose. Under the protection of Aryan tolerance in the person of Cyrus, King of Persia, a centre was created from which, for tens of centuries, Semitic intolerance was to spread like a poison over the whole earth. According to Chamberlain, those who wish to know who the Jews are must never forget that, thanks to the prophet Ezekiel, and afterwards to Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jew is the teacher of intolerance, religious fanaticism, and of murder for the sake of religion, that he has only appealed to tolerance when he has felt himself oppressed but that he himself has never practised or dared to practise it, for his Law forbids it today and will forbid it tomorrow. To establish Judaism a religion was killed and then mummified and wrapped up in the trappings of innumerable

precepts and ordinances out of which the Mishna and the Talmud grew.

* * *

After this fierce indictment of the Jews, tricked out with a show of erudition which specialists would be needed to appraise, Chamberlain examines the relations between Judaism and Christianity. The two principal pillars upon which the Christian theologians of the first centuries erected the new religion, he claims, were Jewish beliefs and Indo-European symbolical and metaphysical mythology. A struggle between these two elements had broken out immediately after the death of Christ. It was to rage for centuries in the bosom of the Church until it broke out again in the German Reformation. Today it still goes on. It affects even the conception of the Godhead in the contrast between Jehovah, on the one hand, and the ancient Aryan conception of the Trinity which was current in India many centuries before Christ. Judaism, incomparable as will-power, possesses very limited creative capacity; and without the wealth of creative power in the Hellenic spirit, that is to say, without Homer, Plato, and Aristotle (with Persia and India in the background),

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

the Christian Church could never have become the temple of a universal faith. The Aryan conception of the Trinity was the corner-stone on which were built the altars of an entirely new religion. In the nineteenth century an attempt was made to explain away the fact of Christ as a myth. The truth, Chamberlain declares, is the very reverse: Christ is the one thing in Christianity that is not mythical.

The idea that God, becoming man, was born of a Virgin is very old; but the worship of the "Mother of God" was taken over by Christianity from Egypt where, three centuries before Christ, this idea had been zealously propagated. Yet it was long, Chamberlain maintains, before the cult of Isis could force its way into the Christian religion. In the year A.D. 430 the term "Mother of God" was described by Nestorius as a blasphemous innovation. In the history of mythological dogma nothing can be so clearly proved as the direct connection of the Christian worship of the "Mother of God" with the Egyptian worship of Isis. Our Indo-European idea of "sin" is, according to Chamberlain, altogether mythical. Jewish theologians vigorously reject the conception of original sin which the Christians derived from the Old Testament

and regard as proving the need for redemption by Grace. The Catholic Church, emphasising the importance of Works as opposed to Grace, could not help diminishing the importance of Grace; but the Fall and Grace are so closely connected that the least touching of the one affects the other. It is a fight between the Law and Grace. For the Jews, the Law suffices. For Christianity, according to St. Paul: "If righteousness came by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain."

Though the Jewish religion discourages conversion, the Gentiles, impelled by a longing for faith, had gone over to it in crowds. The secret attraction of Judaism was its will-power, which created blind faith. Whereas Indo-European thought and mysticism often run in the direction of renouncing the will to live, the Jews had the unconditional will to live, and this will was the first thing that Judaism gave to Christianity. A second Jewish gift was a sense of certainty. When Christianity arose, the mass of men were sick of theories. Greek philosophy and metaphysics and Roman mythology alike failed to satisfy them. They wanted certainty. The teaching of the early Christians gave it them. The satisfaction of this desire by Christianity signified the triumph

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

of the Jewish philosophy and religious outlook. It was St. Paul, the son of a Jew of the tribe of Benjamin and, probably (Chamberlain believes), of a Greek mother, who stamped the traditions of the Old Testament upon Christianity. The heathen always attracted him—a largely non-Jewish mind, with a Talmudic education—and he embodied in himself the two conflicting currents in the Christian religion.

From the Jewish current came also the absolute spiritual autocracy of Rome, against which the Germanic influence in the Church constantly revolted—a revolt exemplified in Charlemagne, in Dante (who was a Teuton), and, later, in the Lutheran Reformation. Some have doubted whether Luther was right to revolt; yet the history of Germanic civilisation proves him to have been right. The civilisation and culture which, radiating from Northern Europe, today dominate a considerable part of the world, are the work of Teutonism, a work which is beyond question the greatest yet accomplished by man. What is not Teutonic in it consists mainly of alien elements still unexorcised. This work was not accomplished by belief in authority but by free enquiry, not by being content with little,

but by insatiable, ravenous hunger. No one will have the audacity to assert that the Teutons, with their virtues and without their vices—such as greed, cruelty, treachery, disregard of all rights save their own right to rule—would have won the victory; but everybody must admit that in the very places where they were most cruel (as, for instance, the Anglo-Saxons in England, the Teutonic Order in Prussia, the French and English in North America) they laid by their cruelty the surest foundation of what is highest and most moral.

Not to distinguish between “Teutonic” and “German” is a grievous mistake. If, Chamberlain argues, the Germans alone are looked upon as the direct heirs of the Teutons, the fact is concealed that the non-German North of Europe is almost purely Teutonic, in the narrower sense of the word, and the truth is overlooked that it was precisely in Germany, the centre of Europe, that the fusion of the three Aryan branches (Celts, Teutons, and Slavs) took place—a circumstance which explains the distinct national character and the rich gifts of the German people. There is a Teutonic civilisation but there is no such thing as a French or a German civilisation.

In Chamberlain's eyes it is, for example, an

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

astonishing error to regard the French Revolution as a turning-point in history. The Revolution was inevitable simply because the Reformation did not succeed in France. For this failure the Jesuits were mainly responsible, and the Jesuit spirit is largely Semitic. Loyola, its creator, was the leader in the struggle against the Germanic spirit. He was a Basque by race, was influenced by a Jew, Paolanko, and drew his spiritual exercises mainly from Islamic sources. At the time of the Reformation France was still too rich in pure Teutonic blood to fall silently into decay like Spain.

The French Protestants or Huguenots were in a fatal position. They stood out not only against Rome but also against the French Kingship, and opposed the King's endeavours to create a national unity. Experience has proved that, even in Catholic countries, a strong Kingship is the most powerful bulwark against Roman politics. When the Huguenots were worsted and gave up political aspirations they remained merely a religious sect and were annihilated and scattered. The number of them who went into exile is estimated at more than a million. France has never recovered from this loss of the choicest of her population. Thereafter she fell a prey to the Jews. It was

not the King of France but the Jesuits who wrought the destruction and exile of the Huguenots, for the French were formerly no more intolerant than the other Teutons. It was Jesuit intolerance, with its Semitic origin, that did the damage; and then the famous Papal Bull *Unigenitus* of 1713 (by which Pope Clement XI condemned Jansenism, and Gallican tendencies towards independence of Rome) completed the ruin of the French Church. Thus the time grew ripe for revolution and, in 1789, the French people rose with the proverbial rage of the long-suffering Teuton against Monarch and Church alike. The revolution was, however, devoid of true moral background and was not led by any really great man.

Chamberlain insists that he does not overlook the influence of economic conditions in pre-Revolutionary France. They were highly important. But he claims that history offers no example of a mighty rebellion brought about solely by economic conditions. Man can bear almost any degree of misery, and the more wretched he is the weaker he becomes. For this reason the great economic revolutions have always taken a comparatively peaceful course. It was neither the poor peasant nor the urban

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

proletariat that caused the French Revolution, but the citizen middle classes, together with a strong section of the nationally minded clergy, and these were stirred and spurred on by the intellectual *élite* of the nation. When the Revolution broke out Frenchmen had been robbed of religion. The declaration of the Rights of Man is really a religious creed. In perspective the French Revolution appears as a climax to a tragedy which had lasted for two hundred years. The first act closed with the murder of Henry IV; the second with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes which had proclaimed toleration; while the third began with the Bull *Unigenitus* and worked up to the inevitable catastrophe. The Revolution was not the dawn of a new day but the beginning of an end.

Rome, the Reformation, and the Revolution, Chamberlain concludes, are the three factors which still influence international politics. France had to pay more dearly for her Revolution than Germany paid for the frightful Thirty Years War, and the Revolution could never give back to France what she failed to acquire through the Reformation. The Teutons in the narrower sense of the word—the Germans, the Anglo-Saxons, the Dutch, and the

THE NORDIC LEGEND

Scandinavians—in whose veins much purer blood still flows, have grown stronger and stronger since that turning-point in history, and this is the conclusive argument which proves that Luther's Germanic policy of revolt against Rome was right.

* * *

The decadence of France, the triumph of non-Semitic Teutonism, and a reading of ethnical and religious history that exalts the power of the Germanic character are the main theses of Chamberlain's *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*. Their semi-mystical extravagance cannot obscure the driving power of such a doctrine when presented to a people like the Germans whose minds had been prepared to receive it by the combined influences of Kant, Hegel, Wagner, Treitschke, and Nietzsche. The Emperor William II read Chamberlain's *Foundations* assiduously and drew from them inspiration for some of his headiest rodomontades. Chamberlain helped, indeed, to foment the German "supermanish" conceit that prepared the way for the Great War. But to-day it is more important to remember that Herr Adolf Hitler learned from Chamberlain not a few of his political

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

precepts, and that the "Nordic Evangel," which Hitler and his fellows have proclaimed, is a lineal descendant of the Gobineau-Chamberlain doctrine of the innate superiority of the Northern Teutonic races. This is why I have examined the doctrine at some length. It is the main source both of the dynamic force in Hitlerism and of the hybrid mystic quality which has made of it the present working religion of the German people.

HITLER AND THE
NAZI MOVEMENT

HITLER AND THE NAZI MOVEMENT

THE bearing of the "Nordic Legend," propounded by Gobineau and Chamberlain, upon Nazi views and doctrines today is illustrated by two recent examples. On October 10, 1933, *The Times* published the following passage from a speech just made to a national gathering of jurists at Nuremberg by Dr. Frank, the Hitlerite Minister of Justice. It ran:—

Antisemites we are, and have been from the beginning. We are so, however, and this we must emphasise, not out of hatred for the Jew but out of love for the German people. We are of opinion that the blood substance of the Germanic race constitutes so pre-eminent and unique an asset of the world as a whole that we should be justified in counting it the duty of the entire human race, in gratitude, to safeguard this basic Germanic element, for we know that from this racial substance have issued the highest achievements of man.

The other example is taken from a memorandum drawn up by the Prussian Ministry of Justice as a basis for a new Nazi penal code

and issued on October 9, 1933. One section of the memorandum, entitled "Protection of Race and Nationality," says:—

The first condition for the new legal order must be that henceforth no Jews, Negroes, or other coloured people can be absorbed into the German blood. The prohibition of blood-mingling must be so interpreted that mingling is forbidden with members of foreign blood-communities, or races whose isolation from German blood is to be regulated by law.

The regulation will not apply to existing marriages between Germans and Jews, but such marriages will be forbidden by law in future, and any physical intimacy between a German and a member of an alien race is to be regarded as treason and to involve punishment for both parties. And it must be remembered that, according to Nazi decrees, any German is a Jew if one of his or her parents or grandparents were Jewish.

Thus, it would seem, the Gobineau-Chamberlain doctrine of Germanic superiority and race-purity must be regarded as dominating the present life of Germany. It is not easy to foresee the lengths to which its influence and its appeal to Germanic self-esteem may yet

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

go; but, before looking into the character and antecedents of Herr Hitler himself and the origins of his movement, it may be well to reflect upon the ingenuity with which Chamberlain shaped the doctrine so that it might stir German instincts and feelings.

As I have said, the potency of the "Nordic Evangel" lies in its quasi-religious character. After having invoked Jewish history to show the value of race-purity, Chamberlain extolled Teutonic race-purity as of higher value, and affirmed that this higher value is menaced by Jewish pollution. He arraigned Judaism as an artificial offshoot of Israel, fostered after the Babylonian captivity by the forgery of a Mosaic Law which enjoined segregation and inbreeding upon the Judaeans. Having thus discredited the Jewish religion, Chamberlain claimed that Judaism, through the Apostles (St. Paul in particular), set its stamp upon Christianity, and that Jewish influence was predominant in creating the intolerant spiritual autocracy of Rome. Against this intolerant autocracy—represented especially by the Jesuits in a spirit largely Semitic—the sturdy Germanic spirit in the Church revolted. Thus, according to Chamberlain, Luther helped to save Teutonism, and, by his Reformation, gave Germany

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

and other Teutonic countries a source of strength of which France was deprived when her Protestant Huguenots were overcome and scattered, with the result that France became a prey to the Jews and was condemned to decadence.

In considering the force with which Chamberlain's doctrine burst upon the German world, and its bearing on the intellectual development of Herr Hitler, dates will be useful. Chamberlain's chief work, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, was published in 1899, when Hitler was ten years old. It was widely read and became a kind of text-book for Germanism. At that moment political pan-Germanism was strong in Austria and was spreading in Germany. The doctrine suited the hour. In April 1897, a Polish Clerical nobleman, Count Badeni, who was Prime Minister of Austria, issued ordinances placing the Czech language on a footing of equality with German as an official language in Bohemia and Moravia. These ordinances, which the Germans of Austria regarded as dethroning the German language from its privileged position, gave rise to an agitation that dominated—and paralysed—Austrian political life for

years. Herr von Schönerer, the Austrian pan-German leader who had drawn up, in 1882, a pan-German programme at Linz, took advantage of this situation to start a movement called "Los von Rom!" ("Cut loose from Rome!"). At the beginning of 1898 he declared: "Let us break at last the chains that bind us to a Church which is the foe of Germanism"; and he himself presently abjured Roman Catholicism in spectacular fashion. Though this movement received vociferous support from Germany, it made little headway. The attachment of the Austrian-Germans to the Catholic Church was too strong. Not more than ten thousand conversions to Protestantism were announced, though Hitler affirms in his book, *Mein Kampf*, that a hundred thousand "cut loose from Rome." Schönerer was fundamentally anti-Hapsburg and antisemitic. Yet he had employed a Jew, the historian Dr. Friedjung, to draw up the original pan-German programme of 1882—and had promptly excluded him from the pan-German party by adding to the programme a proviso that only Germans of pure Aryan descent could be eligible for membership.

At that time, too, another leader of the Austrian-Germans, Dr. Lueger, the Clerical

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

antisemitic Burgomaster of Vienna, was developing the "Christian Social" party on an anti-Jewish basis. Lueger was a demagogue of genius who knew how to move the people; and, like Dr. Sylvester, the German President of the Austrian Chamber, who was to set the fashion of referring to "Germanic Germans" as distinguished from Semitic Germans, Lueger appealed especially to the anti-Jewish feelings of the masses. As I wrote in my book, *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, in 1913: "So large a part does this distinction (between Germanic and Semitic Germans) play in Austrian-German politics that a leading Jewish journalist has declared, bitterly but truthfully, that anti-semitism forms the only bond between the various sections of the Austrian-German 'National' party. Pan-Germanism, in Austria at least, has always had an anti-Jewish tendency."

The excitement and bitterness which the agitations of von Schönerer and Lueger brought into Austrian political life can hardly be conceived by those who never experienced them. From Hitler's own biography, *Mein Kampf*, it is clear that he is a product of this atmosphere of intense racial strife. Without knowledge of this overheated "climate" neither

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

Hitler nor Hitlerism is intelligible. In seeking to analyse the man himself and his movement, one has to breathe this torrid air, an air charged with noxious vapours, and to remember that to Hitler it was the very breath of life.

Adolf Hitler was born on April 20, 1889, at Braunau on the Inn, a frontier town in Upper Austria, where his father was a Customs official. The English edition of *Mein Kampf* unfortunately omits the early pages of the German original in which this formative period of Hitler's boyhood is described. These pages are, however, among the most instructive in the whole book, for they are written with a brooding vehemence characteristic of the surroundings of his youth and adolescence.

Hitler's grandfather was a landless labourer living in such penury that, at the age of thirteen his son, Adolf Hitler's father, fled to Vienna in the hope of learning a trade. Amid many privations he passed his examination as a craftsman's apprentice at the age of seventeen, but fared so ill in his trade that he resolved to "better himself" at all costs. His ambition was to become a State official, and by dint of effort he realised it when he was twenty-three. From Braunau, where he was employed in the Customs, he was transferred to another

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

frontier town, Passau on the Danube, and at last to Linz, the capital of Upper Austria. There, having been pensioned off in his fifty-seventh year, he bought a piece of land with his savings, and set himself to till it. His dearest wish was that his son should become an official likewise. To this end Adolf was to study, not, indeed, in the classical school but on the more practical "modern side" in a *Realschule*. The son had other ideas. He had a marked talent for drawing and was determined not to be an official. Little by little, to his father's horror, he made up his mind to be an artist, a painter. Between the two a stubborn conflict of will began. So obstinate was the youth that at school he refused to learn anything which could possibly fit him for an official career and, as he confesses, he deliberately botched his work on all subjects except history, geography, and drawing.

In the meantime he became an ardent German nationalist. While still a child he had found in his father's library various military works, among them a popular account of the Franco-German war of 1870-71. Burning with enthusiasm for the German victories, he asked why the Austrian Germans had no part in them. Were they not Germans too?

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

The answer, that not all Germans were so happy as to belong to Bismarck's Empire, filled him with envy. His mind had already been stirred by the story of a bookseller from Nuremberg, a German Nationalist and hater of the French, who had been executed at Braunau by the Napoleonic troops early in the century for complicity in an anti-French plot. The story of this martyr for Germanism moved him deeply.

Hitler's father, a dutiful official, hardly guessed how strong were the passions of his son or how early the child was learning to hate an Austria which kept Austrian-Germans from their share in what ought to have been common German glories. At the age of eleven he told his father that nothing on earth would induce him to become an Austrian official, to spend his whole life in filling up forms, and to be cabined in a musty room. The boy loved the fresh air, and became a ringleader of other school-boys whom he harangued with youthful eloquence. Between him and his father began a dour struggle that ended only with his father's death. At school he heard echoes of the fight then going on between the Austrian-Germans and the Slovenes, Czechs, and other Austrian Slavs for control of the

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

districts in which the German language prevailed. To him and to Austrian German school-girls the injunction was addressed: "German boy, forget not that thou art German; and German maid, remember that thou shalt become a German mother." Teachers who seemed to lack zeal for Germanism were soon branded by the school-children as "traitors." Those who, on the contrary, extolled German history were adored. Public collections for the German "School League" helped to fan the flames. True Germans greeted each other by crying "Hail!" and, despite warnings and penalties, sang "Deutschland über alles" to the tune of the Austrian Imperial hymn instead of "Gott erhalte unsern Kaiser" (God preserve the Emperor). In short, Hitler became "German National," and repudiated Austrian or Hapsburg patriotism.

The eloquence of a German teacher of history in the "Real School" at Linz unwittingly turned Adolf Hitler into a revolutionary. How, he writes, could I be loyal to a Hapsburg ruler whose house, in past and present, had betrayed and was betraying the patrimony of the German people for dynastic advantage? Stories of what the House of

Hapsburg had been in the past, how it had allowed alien elements to eat into the body of Germanism, how it was permitting Vienna itself to become less and less a German city, filled the youth with righteous wrath. In later years he wrote—with reference to the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his Consort by Southern Slav conspirators at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914:—"The Imperial House was Czechifying the whole country wherever possible, and it was the fist of the Goddess of Eternal Right and pitiless retribution that struck down the deadliest enemy of Austrian Germanism, the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, precisely by bullets which he himself had helped to mould. Was he not the supreme patron of the Slavisation of Austria?" Gradually Hitler became convinced that the safety of Germanism postulated the destruction of Austria, that German national feelings were incompatible with dynastic patriotism, and that, above all, the House of Hapsburg was fated to bring woe upon the German race. Two passions, he declares, dwelt in his breast—burning love for his Austrian-German homeland, deep hatred of the Austrian State.

A turning-point in his development came when, at the age of 12, he first saw a performance of Wagner's opera *Lohengrin* at Linz. The mysticism and musical charm of Wagner's work lifted him out of himself, deepened his convictions, and stimulated his artistic sense. By this time architecture had taken precedence of painting in his affections, and he began to dream of being a great architect. Then, in his thirteenth year, his father died. His mother no longer insisted that he should become an official, all the less because the weakness of his lungs caused a doctor to advise against office work. But, two years later, his mother died also, after an illness that ate up nearly all the father's savings. Hitler's pension, as the orphan of an official, was too small to keep him alive. He had to think of earning his living; and with a small box of clothes he went to Vienna, as his father had gone before him. Like his father he meant to "better himself," though in no event by becoming an official.

In Vienna he sought to enter the Academy for artists, sat for an examination and was horrified to find himself rejected on the ground that his drawings showed more talent for architecture than for painting. The question was how to enter the School for Architecture

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

since candidates were obliged to possess a leaving certificate from a secondary school. Now Hitler, in his obstinate resolve not to be an official, had ignored most of the subjects needed for a certificate, and was not qualified to be a candidate. Besides, his money gave out. To earn his living he was forced to work first as a bricklayer's labourer, then as a house painter. His wages barely sufficed to still his hunger. Every book he bought, and whenever he went to the opera, he had to stint himself of food. He writes: "Thanks to the goddess of want, who took me in her arms and often threatened to crush me, my will grew strong and conquered at last. Thanks to her I became hard, and can be hard."

In those penurious days Hitler's eyes came to see in Marxism and Jewry the two most frightful dangers to the German race. His work brought him into touch with the Austrian Trade Unions. He soon felt that these organisations, originally intended to improve the lot of wage-earners, were being utilised by Austrian Marxist Socialists, whose leaders were mainly Jews, for political purposes. Thus his revolt against Marxist Socialism and Jewry began. His book *Mein Kampf* contains some shrewd and penetrating passages upon the feelings of

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

the lower strata of society. He writes, for instance:—

The life I had lived in my father's house had been much the same as the life of others. Free from care I could await the dawn of each day, and for me there was no social problem. My youth was passed in the lower middle class, that is to say, in a world that had very little to do with workers by hand. Strange though it may seem at first sight, the gulf between the by no means well-to-do social stratum of the lower middle class and that of simple workmen is often deeper than one thinks. The explanation of this gulf, which almost amounts to enmity, lies in the fear of one social group, which has only recently raised itself above the level of workmen, lest it fall back into its old and less respected class, or at least be looked upon as belonging to it. To this must be added in many cases the repulsive recollections of the intellectual misery of this lower class, the coarseness of its manners and ways of life—recollections that make any contact with it appear intolerable.

In driving him back into this lower world of poverty and insecurity, out of which his father had worked his way, Hitler continues, fate took pity on him by tearing from his eyes the blinkers of a restricted lower-middle-class education. For the first time he learned to know men and to distinguish between hollow appearances or brutal externals and men's inner being.

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

Here we have one of the secrets of Hitler's power over the masses. He had lived their life, had learned to think their thoughts, and to share their outlook. He came to feel contempt for "social status" and for sentimentally philanthropic social reformers. It goes against the grain of those who look upon the masses as objects of charity and condescension, he declares, to admit that, for the masses, it is a question not of concessions but of rights. As an unskilled workman, Hitler found he had few rights and that he could not even be certain of earning his bread from day to day. Amid the misery and vice of Viennese life, amid its brilliant surroundings and ill-distributed wealth, he reached the conclusion that those who would improve things must have a deep feeling of responsibility for laying better foundations of social development, combined with a brutal determination to smash abuses that would not yield to gentler treatment.

Side by side with these reflections ran a feeling of indignation that Austrian-German workmen, who had so little to lose, economically or socially, should be bereft of pride in their race. He saw that the young Austrian-German workman, on leaving school, speedily lost all respect for authority in the filth and

penury of his daily surroundings. So Hitler felt that a people could only be race-proud if its social condition was sound and if it were given something to be proud of. By this standard he judged the political leaders of the Austrian-Germans, and found most of them wanting. Marxism and Social Democracy repelled him. He thought that Marxism ignored the race distinction between Germans and Slavs, took no account of Germanic superiority, and lumped all races together under Jewish control. He felt that if Socialist and Marxist heresies were to be uprooted, the uprooting must be done with the same brutality—he constantly speaks of “brutal” methods—which the Socialists displayed in enforcing discipline upon their own organisations. In a word, the Socialist terror needed a stronger terror to overcome it. Democracy, as practised and preached by Jewish Socialists, was a mockery, and only knowledge of Jewry could give the key to its inner nature.

* * *

One day, in the centre of Vienna, Hitler saw a Jew, probably from Galicia, wearing black ringlets and dressed in a long gaberdine.

Could this creature be a German? he asked himself, and sought an answer in books and pamphlets on the Jewish question. At Linz he had seen few Jews, and only such as were outwardly so "Europeanised" that he had taken them for Germans. Even in Vienna the tone of the antisemitic Press had disgusted him, and he admired, at first, the dignity and breadth of view of important Jewish newspapers, like the *Neue Freie Presse* and the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*. But presently their servility towards the Court, and the Emperor in particular—whom Hitler hated—estranged him, and he began to pay more attention to the anti-Jewish harangues of Dr. Lueger, the antisemitic Burgomaster, and the other "Christian Social" leaders. Nevertheless he still looked askance at them as "reactionary" until his own observation persuaded him that there was something in their anti-Jewish campaign. The rise and growth of the Zionist movement among the Jews struck him as incompatible with Jewish Germanism; and, from this point onwards, he regarded the Jews with growing suspicion and dislike. Jewish influence over the theatre, the cinema, and literature appeared to him demoralising; and, wherever he turned, he thought he saw Jews behind all the pheno-

mena of Viennese life that he felt to be most reprehensible. When at last he discovered that Jews were battenning on prostitution and were engaged in the White Slave traffic he shivered with horror and developed rapidly into an ardent antisemite.

Once in this mood Hitler swallowed eagerly and believed blindly all that he heard or read against the Jews. The Jewish Liberal press, Jewish Marxism, Jewish finance, the Jewish grip on trade and business were in his eyes equally hateful. So, before his stay in Vienna came to an end, he had reached the conviction that the fight for the welfare of the German race must be above all a fight against Jewry. To wage this fight, he believed, was his divine mission; and the second chapter of *Mein Kampf* closes with the passage: "Should the Jew, with the help of his Marxist creed, triumph over the peoples of this world, his crown will be the funeral wreath of mankind, and this planet, empty of men, will once again wander through the ether as it did millions of years ago.

"Eternal Nature wreaks pitiless vengeance upon the transgressors of her commands.

"So today I believe that I act according to the mind of the Almighty Creator: In

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

beating off the Jew I fight for the Work of the Lord.”

* * *

Psychologically, this is one of the most interesting passages in Hitler's autobiography. It reveals at once an advanced stage of persecution mania—the persecution of mankind, of which the Germanic race was the highest expression, by the sinister machinations of Jewry—and the belief, amounting almost to religious mania, that in defending Germanism against the Jews he was doing godly work. There is no reason to doubt Hitler's sincerity—no more reason than to doubt that his mind was falling into a condition of chronic hysteria. Given under-nourishment, an umbrageous temperament, fierce ambition, and the overheated political and social atmosphere of the Austrian capital at that time, it is not hard to understand that Hitler should have become a brooding fanatic who only lacked adequate opportunity to communicate his fanaticism to others.

* * *

Meanwhile his views upon Germanism, both in itself and in relation to Austria, became

more fixed and intense. He looked upon the Germans as the one sound and constructive element in the congeries of Hapsburg peoples, as the builders and preservers of the Austrian Empire, against whom the Czechs, Poles, and other Slavs were waging constant and nefarious warfare. Austrian-German thought, he writes, was big and more than big. Accustomed to live in the framework of a Great Empire, the Austrian-German had never lost the feeling of responsibility for the great tasks which were incumbent upon him. He alone glanced wide and far. His economic relationships embraced the whole realm. Its foreign trade was in his hands, in so far as the Jews had not laid hold of it. Politically he held the Empire together. The corps of army officers and the higher officials were still mainly German, as were art and science, music, architecture, sculpture, and painting. Germanism was the pillar of foreign policy, and though the Magyars were helpful their number was small. But Hitler saw that non-German Austrians also invoked the principle of nationality, that they had begun to build up their own racial organisations, and to attract the fragments of other races more potently than the German-Austrians were able to do. They strove for federalisation,

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

whereas the Hapsburg Monarchy could only have been preserved by ruthless centralisation in German hands. The Hapsburgs were incapable of doing this and of maintaining German overlordship; and among the institutions which fostered the decay of their Monarchy were Parliament and the democratic system.

Before long Hitler concluded that parliamentarism was wrong and harmful, that it was an un-German abortion, and that, in the absence of a strong German majority, rule by majorities was fatal. In the best event a majority could never do duty for a man, for a majority is never anything more than a representative of stupidity and also of cowardice. Objectively considered, he felt, no political principle is so false as the parliamentary principle, and public opinion is little better, especially when it is manufactured by a Jewish Press. The whole thing amounts to the subjection of public interest to a majority of impotent ignoramuses, totally unfit to watch over the destiny of a race. In fact this sort of democracy is the instrument of that race whose dark aims always shun the light and always will. Only the Jew can speak well of an institution that is as filthy and untrue as the Jew himself.

In contradistinction to Parliament stands the truly German conception of democracy based on the free election of its leader who takes over full responsibility for what he does. In it there is no voting by majorities on single questions, but only the choice of one individual who stakes his all upon his decisions. This, thank God! writes Hitler, is the true sense of a Germanic democracy in which there is no room for the impotent and the feeble but only for heroes. It was natural that when the Hapsburgs gave way to the Austrian democratic system and began to sacrifice Austrian-Germanism to their Slav subjects, patriotic German-Austrians should rebel. They felt that human right is stronger than the rights of a State, and that the world has not been made for cowards.

It was the merit of the pan-German movement in Austria, Hitler claims, to have broken with the House of Hapsburg and to have had the courage to cry: "Long live the Hohenzollerns!" in the Austrian Parliament. They rescued true patriotism from the sad embrace of the sorry Hapsburg dynasty, and their movement might have become an avalanche had it been better led. As it was, it was outdistanced by the Christian Social antisemitic

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

movement led by Dr. Lueger. Though Hitler had first been a follower of the pan-German leader, von Schönerer, he realised that Dr. Lueger was the stronger man, and that, unlike von Schönerer, Lueger knew how to sway the masses and to gain the ear of the lower middle class. Lueger determined to conquer Vienna, the heart of the Hapsburg Monarchy, and conquered it, but he could not save the Monarchy itself, for it was too late; and in this respect von Schönerer saw more clearly than Lueger. But, in Hitler's view, Schönerer's movement broke down because it failed to see the importance of the social problem for a revolutionary party, and because its appeal was mainly to the upper middle class. Lueger was more clear-sighted, though his sphere of action was too limited. Moreover Lueger had the Roman Church on his side, whereas von Schönerer's "Los von Rom" movement was hostile to the Church. Protestantism, Hitler explains, suits Germanism best in so far as it is German in origin and in its later traditions, but it breaks down when the defence of German race interests requires other ideas and general principles than those of Protestantism. Besides, the dogmatic relationship of Protestantism to Jewry is too close. Protestants are too objective,

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

and are not uncompromising enough when it is a question of a life and death struggle for the welfare of a race. A political leader should look upon the religious teachings and institutions of his people as intangible. Otherwise he ought to be a religious reformer, not a politician. Any other course must lead to disaster, especially in Germany. Not to have recognised this was the undoing of the pan-German movement in Austria; and though Lueger's Christian Social antisemitic movement was wiser, it failed likewise because it placed the fight against the Jews upon a religious instead of a racial basis. Thus it could only take half-measures and, in the end, found that, when it thought it had got the Jews by the ears, the Jews were really leading it by the nose.

Still, Hitler believes that if the pan-German movement had been better led it might have triumphed, for its antisemitism was inspired by true perception of the race problem and not, in the first instance, by religious notions. Therefore its fight against a particular creed, the Roman Catholic, was tactically wrong.

* * *

Convinced of the hopelessness of doing any-

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

thing in so mixed a State as Austria, Hitler became less and less Austrian and more and more German at heart. He could never forget his native Upper Austrian dialect, almost identical with that of Lower Bavaria, nor learn the dialect of Vienna. So he seized joyfully a chance that came in the spring of 1912, in his twenty-third year, to leave Vienna for Munich, a true German city, so different from Vienna, where people spoke real German, where Jews were less prominent, and where Czechs, Poles, Magyars, Slovenes, and Southern Slavs did not mar the landscape. In Munich, too, he was able to work as a budding artist, to live for painting instead of painting for a living. He could take part in German political life and observe German foreign policy. To his astonishment he found that the Germans of Germany, even in Munich, knew little of Austria. They still looked upon it as a German State. They did not understand that their alliance with Austria-Hungary and with Italy was a sinister and dangerous encumbrance. Nor did they see that a country like Germany has no business to possess colonies and to indulge in a colonial policy until it had settled its own people on land of its own. The case of England was no proof to the contrary. When

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

people look at the British Empire they often forget the Anglo-Saxon world as such, and ignore the fact that the possession of a common language and culture with the United States places England in a position that cannot be compared with that of any other European State. The only chance for Germany to follow a healthy policy, a policy of acquiring fresh land in Europe, would have been to agree with England and to carve new realms for Germany out of the body of Russia. With England at her back, Germany might have begun a new eastward march of the Germans; for, as in the olden days, the sword must be the first plough.

* * *

Hitler's life in Munich was interrupted in the summer of 1914 by the outbreak of the war, a war which, he believes, a wiser German policy would have avoided. Yet it was lucky for Germany, he thought, that the war should have broken out over an Austrian quarrel with Serbia, so that the Hapsburgs were forced to stand by Germany's side. Otherwise they would have been just as "neutral" as Italy was. But war once declared, Hitler looked upon it as a war of German liberation and, over-

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

come by enthusiasm, fell upon his knees and thanked Heaven with overflowing heart that to him had been vouchsafed the happiness of living in such an hour. He had left Austria for political reasons and was determined not to fight as an Austrian soldier. So on August 3, 1914, he petitioned the King of Bavaria for leave to join a Bavarian regiment. To his joy, leave was given next day. His gratitude knew no bounds. Shortly afterwards, he says, he donned the uniform which he was to wear for nearly six years.

He did not disgrace it. He forced his nerves into a sort of heroic stoicism, and fought well and bravely. He became an orderly, a corporal, was decorated for valour and, on October 7, 1916, was wounded. For two years at the front he had seen no German who was not in uniform; and he started with fright when he first heard the voice of a German nurse in the field hospital. The change from the mud of the trenches to the clean sheets of a hospital bed struck him as uncanny. More uncanny still did it seem to him that other wounded soldiers in a hospital near Berlin should boast of their cowardice and talk against the war. Many agreed with them, and none were punished. When Hitler was convalescent

he was allowed to go into Berlin, where he found in the Homes for Soldiers the same defeatist tone as had alarmed him in hospital. Still worse was it at Munich after he had been drafted into a reserve battalion. There the clumsiness and arrogance of elderly officers, who had never been to the front, towards men who had fought in the field caused vexation and engendered a factious spirit. He noticed, too, that nearly all the clerical work of the army was done by Jews who had managed, in one way or another, to get "cushy jobs" far from the front. In Hitler's eyes the Jewish "spider was beginning slowly to suck the people's blood." He found, moreover, that the Bavarians were turning against the Prussians, and he suspected that ancient feuds between the German tribes were being worked up again. Therefore he rejoiced when, in March 1917, he was able to rejoin his old regiment in the fighting line.

By the end of 1917 the collapse of Russia and the defeat of Italy had filled the German army with fresh vigour and hope. It looked forward eagerly to the spring of 1918. But Germany was not to conquer. Hitler alleges that a strike of munition workers was organised in the rear, the front was starved of munitions,

THE NAZI MOVEMENT

its offensive hampered, the enemy saved, and that international capital had become the master of Germany. Thus, he thought, the secret aim of the Marxist swindlers had been attained. At the very moment when the German divisions at the front were receiving their last training for the great attack fixed for March 21st, a general strike broke out in Germany. The French, English, and American Press proclaimed that Germany was on the eve of a revolution—the best means of putting the French *poilu* and the English Tommy on their feet again. “Thus it was possible once more,” Hitler writes, “to get them to use their rifles and machine guns, and to offer confident resistance instead of panic-stricken flight.”

* * *

Hitler believed, doubtless still believes, all this. He seems to have had no real knowledge of how things stood on the other side. He says, textually: “If the West front had held firm for a few months victory must have come. In the Parliaments of the Allied countries the possibilities of the future were recognised, and unheard-of sums were voted to carry on propaganda for the disintegration of Germany.”

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

I feel some diffidence in setting my poor knowledge against Herr Hitler's affirmations; but as I had something to do with the British Department for Propaganda against the Enemy from first to last, and know what sums it spent, I am able to state without fear of contradiction that the total cost of its operations amounted to £70,000 in a war on which Great Britain alone was then spending £7,000,000 a day, and that of these £70,000 a considerable proportion went in helping to keep up the spirit of Allied countries like Italy, and were not utilised directly against the enemy. The work was mainly done by a group of voluntary officials whose days were given to this labour of love or, as Herr Hitler might perhaps call it, this labour of hate, and whose nights were chiefly devoted to their ordinary professional work. The total cost of the Inter-Allied propaganda mission of which I had the honour to be the head in the spring of 1918, for the space of five weeks in Italy and on the Italian front, was £350 sterling—truly an "unheard-of sum."

* * *

Hitler took part in the last great German offensive on the Western front and was still

in the field in October 1918. A British attack with mustard gas in the night from the 13th to the 14th of October, near Ypres, laid him low. This gas the Germans had long been using. Hitler writes: "The British used this gas, of which the effects were still unknown to us, at least in so far as experience of them in our own bodies was concerned." He staggered to the rear and, a few hours later, felt his eyes burning like coals and blindness overcoming him. He was transported to a hospital in Pomerania and was still there during the German revolution of November 1918. As he grew stronger and recovered his sight he became more and more convinced that the Jews were responsible for the appalling disaster that had befallen Germany and for delivering her up to the enemy. When news of the revolution and the establishment of a German Republic was given to him in hospital by a weeping pastor, Hitler also, who had not shed tears since the death of his mother, was convulsed with bitter weeping. All had been in vain, all the slaughter, all the heroism, all the sacrifice! Its only result was that "a gang of wretched criminals had laid hands upon the Fatherland."

Next day Hitler saw what his destiny must

be. He laughed at the thought of having once worried over his own material future. The Emperor William had been the first German Emperor to offer his hand in reconciliation to the leaders of Marxism, without dreaming that rascals have no sense of honour and that, even as they grasped the Imperial hand, they fumbled with the other hand for a dagger. "With the Jews," concludes Hitler, "there can be no bargaining, but only a choice between one thing or the other. So I resolved to become a politician."

MASS SUGGESTION AND
PERSECUTION MANIA

CHAPTER III

MASS SUGGESTION AND PERSECUTION MANIA

WHEN Hitler made up his mind to become a politician he resolved, in effect, to find ways and means of transmitting to others the species of persecution mania from which he had long been suffering as a member of the German race. This mania began in the overheated Austrian racial atmosphere of his boyhood and youth, and was aggravated by the downfall of Germany at the end of the War. A morbid temperament, nervous to the point of hysteria, and a fevered imagination led him to dramatise himself as the Heaven-sent saviour of his people, a man with a divine mission. The power of mass-suggestion, which he afterwards developed to a high degree of efficiency, was already latent in him; and for the exercise of this power he possessed also an indispensable faculty, that of self-persuasion or auto-suggestion to the point of self-hypnosis.

For years his mind had been governed by the fixed idea that Jews, Socialists, and believers in Parliamentary democracy were engaged in

HITLER : WHENCE AND WHITHER ?

nefarious persecution of the German race, and that, in seeking to put an end to this persecution with the needful violence and brutality, he would be doing the Work of the Lord. His mood of pathological exasperation had been heightened by his experience at the front, by his wounds and the effects of being gassed, and especially by the defeatist temper of his comrades in hospital ; and it was in a condition of chronic nervous and mental exaltation that he cast about for means of carrying his resolve into effect.

Upon the spirit in which he undertook his task certain passages in his autobiography, *Mein Kampf*, throw a very interesting light. He asked himself whether ideas, especially ideas of spiritual or semi-religious quality, can be uprooted by naked violence alone. He felt that, reprehensible though they were, the ideas inculcated by Marxist Socialism possessed this quality.

I, at all events, cannot contest this conclusion. As I wrote in my book, *Through Thirty Years*, in 1924, the German Socialist leaders had turned their party into a kind of Church. I pointed out that, while much of the strength of Marxist Socialism in Germany had been derived from the circumstance that, on the one

MASS SUGGESTION

hand, it represented almost the only effective form of liberal and democratic protest against the Prussian State and, on the other, from the fact that it was an organisation as rigid in its way as the Prussian State itself, the German Socialist creed offered, to those who believed in Marx, a substitute for religion itself. At a time when the old philosophies were losing their hold and the Churches were reeling under the blows of scientific criticism, the Marxist doctrine, with its materialist philosophy of History, its economic syllogisms, and its promise of a better life to be attained through the Socialist State, seemed to fill, with grounds for positive faith, a void of which many Germans had been vaguely conscious. These grounds for faith acquired convincing force from the uncompromising vehemence with which Marx stated half-truths as whole truths. Mere argument, I added, rarely moves the masses. Ideas that are put forward with all the qualifications requisite for approximate accuracy have little "drive" and cannot sway men's minds. Marx and his disciples propounded a set of dogmas, created emotions about them and, in reality, founded a materialist economic Church. They left little or no place for the influence of generous ideas or for the ideals of

justice or liberty. In words which I once heard Marx's son-in-law, Paul Lafargue, use in public: "Marx turned God out of history."

This analysis of German Social Democracy was written about a year before Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf*. Therefore his reflections upon the way to uproot Marxism are to me of peculiar interest. After explaining that violence alone, without the motive-power of a mental or spiritual principle, can never destroy an idea or prevent its dissemination, unless those who hold the idea are themselves destroyed to the last man—a process which may seriously enfeeble the State which engages in it—Hitler concludes that it would be futile to fight Marxism if the attack upon it were not inspired by a new conception of spiritual or semi-spiritual quality. He maintains that brutal violence, no matter how pertinaciously and ruthlessly it may be employed, can only bring victory in a struggle between opposing political creeds or philosophical conceptions, if such violence has behind it the force of a faith.

Here, Hitler thought, lay the reason why Bismarck's anti-Socialist laws of exception had failed to achieve their object in the 'eighties of last century. For, by entrusting the fate of his anti-Marxist legislation to middle-class demo-

MASS SUGGESTION

cracy and Parliamentary institutions, the Iron Chancellor merely set goats to guard his cabbages. Things were no better during the War. There had been no real substitute for Marxist doctrine to place before the masses; and the notions of class and of the class-struggle, which inspired the Social Democratic organisation, had taken too firm a hold of German minds to be easily dispelled. So long as the middle classes took their ideas from the Jewish democratic Press, and despised workers by hand, it was impossible for them to get rid of the Marxist plague. This was why, Hitler explains, he had never felt able to join any political party before the War. He realised that a new party would be needed to wage pitiless war against Social Democracy.

* * *

The success of any new party, Hitler was persuaded, must depend upon the character and the vigour of its propaganda. Now propaganda is a means to an end, not an end in itself, and its form must be determined by the end in view. Just as in war the question of humaneness or brutality is decided solely by the consideration of finding the shortest way to victory—did not Moltke declare that the

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

humanest form of war is the most ruthless because it tends to shorten the war itself?—so political warfare can take no account of elegance but must think only of what is most effective. Nothing is less elegant than slavery; and, of all forms of slavery, enslavement to the Jews is the ugliest. In a fight for the preservation of the German people from the Jewish danger the cruellest weapons would be the most humane if they could hasten the hour of victory.

A further question was whether propaganda should be addressed to the educated classes or to the less educated masses. The answer, says Hitler, must always be: To the masses. A poster that advertises an art exhibition may be a work of art in so far as it suggests to the masses the importance of the exhibition; but it cannot and ought not to do duty for the exhibition itself. In the same way, the scientific enlightenment of individuals cannot be the task of propaganda, which has to put certain facts, events, and necessities into the minds of the masses. Therefore propaganda must appeal more to their feelings than to their understanding. Propaganda must be carried on at a level not higher than that of the most limited intelligence. This level must be lower and lower

MASS SUGGESTION

in proportion as the masses of human beings to whom it is addressed are greater and wider. If a whole people is to be brought under its influence, the utmost care must be taken in avoiding too high a level of appeal.

The lighter the scientific ballast of propaganda, Herr Hitler continues, and the more it is addressed exclusively to the feelings of the masses, the surer is its success. Success is the best proof of its rightness or wrongness. This is not understood by people who are too-clever-by-half. The receptivity of the masses is very restricted, their range of comprehension is narrow, and their forgetfulness great. For these reasons effective propaganda must be restricted to very few points, and these points must be summed up in catchwords until the lowest of the low understands the catchwords to mean what they are meant to mean. Unless this principle be faithfully observed the effect will be lost, since the crowd can never digest or retain what is offered to it.

The tactics of propaganda must also be psychologically sound. It is totally wrong to ridicule an adversary. German war propaganda made this mistake, whereas British and American war propaganda was shrewd in representing the Germans as barbarians and Huns. In this

HITLER : WHENCE AND WHITHER ?

way British and American soldiers were led to expect that the enemy would use the most horrible weapons, and to look upon German use of such weapons as proof of the expected German "Hunnishness." The German soldiers, on the contrary, who had been taught to despise the enemy, became distrustful of what they had been told when they gained direct experience of the enemy's fighting quality.

Besides, it was altogether wrong, after the War, to discuss the question of war guilt from the standpoint that Germany had not been solely responsible. It would have been right to cast the whole burden of war guilt upon the enemy, even if this had been less true than it really was. The masses cannot see at what point foreign wrong ends and their own wrong begins. They become doubtful and uncertain, especially if the enemy does not make the same blunder but throws the whole blame on to their country. The character of the people at large is feminine. Its feelings are stronger than its brains. It is not accessible to fine distinctions but only to positives and negatives, love or hate, right or wrong, truth or falsehood ; and, as the masses are dull-minded, time is needed to make them understand. Only the repetition of the simplest notions, a thousand times over,

MASS SUGGESTION

ends by impressing their memories. Nor, if the subject of propaganda be changed, must its object differ. At the end of every pronouncement the catchword must come as a convincing conclusion. The immense effects of propaganda conducted upon these big lines will astonish those who persistently undertake it.

* * *

Pondering these ideas in his mind, Hitler returned, in November 1918, to the reserve battalion of his regiment. He found it in the hands of a Communist "Soldiers' Council," but managed to get quarters in a camp elsewhere. In March 1919 this camp was broken up and he had to return to Munich. An order for his arrest, for public opposition to the revolutionary authorities, was issued on April 27th. The men sent to arrest him liked the sight of his carbine so little that they let him escape. A few days later the revolutionary Government was itself overthrown, and he was ordered by his military superiors to take part in an enquiry into its doings. With some of his comrades he agreed that a new party must be founded, and thought of calling it a "Social Revolutionary Party"; and, after listening to an address by one Gottfried Feder upon international capital,

stock exchanges, and bankers' loans, he saw what one of the essential bases of such a party must be. The programme of a party, he writes, must not be judged by the chance of realising its aims but only by their rightness and by their influence upon human development. The objects for which Hitler, under the influence of Gottfried Feder, came to feel that his party must strive were summed up in the single phrase: "People and Fatherland." "What we have to fight for," he writes, "is to assure the existence and the increase of our race and our people, the feeding of its children and the purity of its blood, the freedom and independence of the Fatherland, so that our people may be mature to fulfil the mission entrusted to it by the Creator of the Universe."

One day, while Hitler was still in the army, he was ordered to find out what was going on in an apparently political association which, under the name of "German Workers' Party," was about to hold a meeting at Munich. At this meeting Gottfried Feder was to speak. Hitler was told to attend the meeting and to report upon it. He found some twenty or twenty-five people there, mainly from the lower classes. Not greatly impressed by the proceedings, he was about to leave when a

speaker in the discussion upon Gottfried Feder's address recommended a union between Bavaria and Austria, and the separation of both from Prussia. This angered Hitler, who fiercely denounced the notion, and walked out. But a workman followed him, pressed a pamphlet into his hand, and begged him to read it. The pamphlet was entitled *My Political Awakening*. It explained how its author, the workman in question, had escaped from the chaos of Marxist and Trade Union phraseology and had learned to think as a German. Soon afterwards Hitler received a postcard to say that he had been chosen as a member of the "German Workers' Party" and asking him to attend a meeting of its Council. Despite his surprise at this method of recruiting members, Hitler went to the meeting. It consisted of four young fellows and a Chairman. The whole thing struck him as so wretched a hole-and-corner affair that he had half a mind to turn his back on it. Yet the earnestness and helplessness of the "Council" moved him; and, after some days of uncertainty, he decided to accept membership. The total funds of the "Party" amounted to seven shillings and sixpence. "My decision to join it," he says, "was the most decisive resolve of my life." He was given a

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

provisional card of membership which bore the number seven.

Nothing hampered the Party more than its insignificance, Hitler writes. In truth it was neither a party nor a movement. Its so-called meetings were miserable failures. Invitations to attend them were ignored. The seven members of the Party formed the whole "public." At last, by carrying round typewritten notices to various places, the "public" was gradually increased to eleven and in time to twenty-four. Enough money was presently collected to advertise a meeting in a newspaper. One hundred and eleven people came. At this meeting Hitler realised that he could speak in public. After he had spoken thirty minutes the sum of 300 marks (£15 at par) was collected. Thus it became possible to print a party programme and to issue leaflets. Hitler then decided to persuade as many as possible of his young comrades in the army to join the Party, disciplined young fellows for whom the word "impossible" had no meaning. He felt, too, that the "officials" of the Party were quite unsuited to the sort of agitation he had in view, and that he needed men who would be prepared to meet Marxist terrorism with fiercer terrorism. At a meeting in October 1919 he

MASS SUGGESTION

spoke nearly an hour to one hundred and thirty people, his comrades having thrown disturbers downstairs with broken heads. Little by little the meetings caught on, until four hundred people came and good sums of money could be collected. In order to attract more members to the Party its name was changed, and it began to call itself the "National Socialist German Workers' Party," or "National - Sozialistische Arbeiter - Partei Deutschlands." The first two syllables of the first word *National* are the origin of the name "Nazi."

By the beginning of 1920 Hitler felt that a mass meeting must be held. The Chairman of the Party objected, but gave way and resigned. Another Chairman was chosen—the workman who had given the pamphlet to Hitler—and Hitler himself took over propaganda. He decided to use red posters, as the colour most likely to irritate the Socialists. His only thought was how to fill the big hall that had been hired. In this he succeeded. Nearly two thousand came, though half the public seemed to be Communists or non-party men. When disturbers began to make trouble Hitler's war comrades fought and subdued them. The meeting lasted four hours, ended amid great

enthusiasm, and persuaded Hitler that he had lit a fire which nobody could put out.

* * *

How Hitler spread this fire among the masses may be guessed from his views upon propaganda. As he wrote in the earlier editions of *Mein Kampf* (the passage was deleted in the twelfth and subsequent editions published since 1932): "The German has not the slightest notion how a people must be misled if the adherence of the masses is sought."

Truth to tell, Hitler found the masses already misled, and ready for his guiding hand. They had been persuaded that not only was Germany not more responsible than her enemies for bringing on the war but that she alone was truly guiltless. From a very early stage all suggestions and publications to the contrary had been officially discountenanced. Since Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles implied Germany's "war guilt" as the basis for reparations, the war guilt problem became immensely important. On this point Conservatives and Social Democrats joined hands because, it was argued, if only the "war-guilt lie" could be demolished, the reason for further reparation payments would be destroyed. In 1922 a

Catholic Chancellor, Herr Wirth, had protested publicly against the "war-guilt lie," and the official denial of war responsibility became almost a compulsory article of national faith. Cinema films bearing on it were censored by the German Foreign Office, and no deviation from the thesis of German innocence was allowed to pass. Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer, the famous correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News* in Berlin and, until his recent removal to Tokyo under Nazi pressure, Chairman of the Foreign Press Association there, explains this point clearly in his remarkable and truthful book *Germany Puts the Clock Back*—a book which everyone who cares to understand Hitlerism should read. He writes: "It is impossible to overestimate the influence this [anti-war-guilt] propaganda had in preparing the reaction. For the German revolution [of November 1918] had been, in part, a protest against the conduct of the old leaders in first starting a war and then losing it. But if the responsibility of these leaders was not really so great as that of Frenchman and Russians, then indeed the November Revolution had been a useless and destructive outbreak of misplaced passion. Thus the legend which was later to take shape round the 'November Crime' was really half-created

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

by pacifists who wished to rid their country of reparations by fighting the imputation of *exclusive* 'war guilt.' ”

From the denial of exclusive war guilt to the affirmation of Germany's complete and exclusive innocence was but a step. And, as Mr. Mowrer shrewdly says in the same book, "It was not Imperialistic scheming, but vanity amounting almost to a vital need, that caused the people to deny reality in the form of its own war responsibility and defeat. What to foreigners seemed wrong-headedness or sheer duplicity was mere incapacity to face a truth incompatible with the national self-esteem."

Nor should it be forgotten that the inflation of the German currency, during and after the passive resistance to the French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923, had prepared the way for Hitler's propaganda by destroying the savings of nearly the whole German middle class and lower middle class. All their investments in national loans, and in the loans of the various provinces and municipalities, were wiped out or "redeemed" in paper marks which, originally worth one shilling each, were inflated until they were worth only one thousand millionth of a shilling. Apart from other sources of anti-Jewish feeling, Hitler's propaganda was greatly

helped by the belief that, where so many good Germans had been ruined by inflation and by the subsequent restoration of a new paper mark to its former value, the quick-witted and unscrupulous Jew had somehow contrived to escape the general disaster.

Side by side with Hitler's anti-Jewish propaganda went, of course, the glorification of the "Aryan" race and the dissemination of what I have called the "Nordic Evangel," with its subtle appeal to a people which had fallen into the depths of despair. A passage from *Mein Kampf* serves to show how thoroughly Hitler had taken it over and how emphatically he preached it. True genius, he declares, is always inborn, never learned or acquired by education. This is true not only of individuals but of the race, and is seen most clearly in *the* race, the Aryan race, which has borne and is bearing upon its shoulders the weight of human culture and civilisation. Other and lower races may have had their work to do, just as horses had before the advent of the motor car, and it was right that they should serve the higher races as horses served men. Only pacifist fools can boggle at the reduction of such races to servitude. Human progress is like an endless ladder which cannot be climbed without

HITLER : WHENCE AND WHITHER ?

treading upon its lower rungs. So, the Aryan race had to climb the hard upward path to reality, not the path of which modern pacifists dream. "Thus it is no accident that the earliest civilisations arose where the Aryan, in collision with lower peoples, put his yoke upon them and made them subject to his will. These peoples were the first technical instrument in the service of a developing culture. . . . Cross-breeding, and the race degradation which it entails, are the sole causes of the dying out of old civilisations; for men do not perish by losing wars. They perish by the loss of the staying-power which is proper to pure blood. Whatever in this world is not of good race is mere chaff."

* * *

This is unadulterated Gobineau-Chamberlain doctrine; and the moral was plain. The Jews were the lower race that was persecuting the pure German Aryan, in league with persecuting enemy countries which pretended that Germany had been guilty of bringing on the War—a war of German self-defence, a war, moreover, that Germany had lost only through Jewish and Marxist treason. The Jews must be put in their places and denied membership of the

German race. Only thus could the glorious destiny of the Nordic Germanic Aryan be fulfilled. A trumpet call must arouse the people from their death-like slumber. Hence Hitler's cry: "Deutschland, Erwache!" (Germany, Awake!).

As Mr. Mowrer says, "Adolf Hitler saw the young Germans and won them to his banner chiefly because he found them at the moment of their deepest material and spiritual despair. To their empty lives he gave a meaning, however meretricious." This meaning was by no means negative only. Hitler felt that the various "defence associations" could lead nowhere, and that, without a positive aim, the enthusiasm of the masses, and particularly of the young, would wane. He writes: "The lack of a great formative idea always hampers the fighting spirit. Fanatical belief in the necessity of winning victory for a new revolutionary order on this earth is needed to convince people of their right to employ the most brutal weapons. Therefore a movement that does not fight for the highest aims and ideals will never be able to grasp the decisive weapon."

The young National Socialist movement set out from the standpoint that, while the idea which inspired it must be intellectually pre-

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

sented, the possibility of thus presenting it must also be ensured by main force. In his earliest meetings at Munich Hitler had employed his comrades from the army as a troop to keep order or, in other words, as "chuckers-out." To them he gave the name of "Storm Detachment" because they only represented a section of the movement. He would not on any account allow these men to join other semi-militarist associations, some of which, like the notorious "Feme," were in reality secret murder gangs. "What we need and needed," Hitler writes, "were not a hundred or two hundred daring conspirators but hundreds of thousands of fanatical fighters for our cause. Mighty mass demonstrations, not secret conventicles, are to be our spheres of work. The conquest of the streets can alone clear the way for us, not daggers or poison or pistols. We have to make Marxism understand that National Socialism is the future lord of the streets, exactly in the same way as National Socialism will presently become lord of the State."

* * *

This programme of action was written by Hitler in 1924 while he was serving a sentence of five years' detention in a fortress at

Landsberg-am-Lech for his part in a *Putsch*, or armed rising, in which he had been involved in 1923. The Bavarian Conservative leader, Gustav von Kahr, had made Bavaria into a refuge for all North German rebels against Socialist Berlin. At Munich Hitler met General von Ludendorff, who had taken some part in the abortive Kapp *Putsch* in Berlin; and Hitler, the ex-corporal, was by no means displeased to consort with a former military commander and a "social better" on equal terms. Was he not already a well-known figure who lectured, night after night, on everything from biology to high politics—with the invariable refrain that the true Germany had been betrayed and was being polluted by Jews and Socialists—to large and enthusiastic audiences? With Ludendorff, Hitler planned a *Putsch* in Munich, by way of protest against the French occupation of the Ruhr; and even after the Bavarian Government (which originally favoured the plan) had, in common with the authorities at Berlin, decided to make terms with the French, to stabilise the mark and to restore order in the country, Hitler and Ludendorff went on with their plan without the military backing which could alone have ensured success. Hitler began by firing a revolver into the ceiling of a

crowded hall in a Munich beer palace—and ended by throwing himself so violently on to the stones of a Munich street, in order to dodge bullets unexpectedly fired against the rebels from the machine guns of the Reichswehr, that he damaged his shoulder. Ludendorff showed more nerve and was unhurt. Yet it would be a mistake to think Hitler a coward. The repressive action of the Reichswehr was so sudden that he had no time to get his nerves under control. For his part in the rising at a Bavarian court, frightened lest Hitler reveal the earlier complicity of the Bavarian authorities in his and Ludendorff's plan, sentenced him to five years' detention in a fortress. He was set free at the end of eight months. It was during this period of mild imprisonment that he wrote *Mein Kampf*.

Leisure for reflection, and the actual work of putting his notions on to paper, wrought a change in Hitler. He gave up all idea of rebellion. When he came out he found that the National Socialist Party was languishing, and speedily took steps to revive it. At his first meeting he charged one mark admission fee to the big circus in which it was held. Eight thousand persons crowded into a building intended for six thousand. Under the influence

of two of his associates, Gregor and Otto Strasser (since frowned upon for their semi-Communist proclivities), and of a young man named Joseph Goebbels (the present Hitlerite Minister for Propaganda), the movement was becoming more Socialistic than national in tone and aim. Hitler loathed Socialism in any form, however much he might play with Socialistic ideas to attract the masses. He was and is a violent reactionary; and he soon took steps to ensure that all party decisions should be taken by him alone. So marked were his talents as showman and mob orator that none could gainsay him. In all the descriptions I have read of his methods, the best by far is that written by Mr. Mowrer in the chapter "A Showman of Genius" of his book *Germany Puts the Clock Back*. With full acknowledgment to Mr. Mowrer and with the permission of his publisher, Mr. John Lane, I will summarise it.

* * *

Anywhere in Germany, any time between 1928 and 1932.

The biggest hall in the town, packed with people, many of them under twenty-five. Just below the roof hang enormous flags—on a plain red ground, a round white centre, and on this, in bold black, a swastika, or hooked cross. Athwart one end of the

hall, in huge letters, the ritual greeting "Deutschland, Erwache!" Near the entrances, round the walls, and especially near the empty platform, stand sturdy youths in mustard-coloured shirts, leather leggings, and semi-military caps.

A great many of those present have paid—for the privilege of coming—anything from a few pence to a pound, according to their means and the seats they occupy. Yet the meeting is packed. It is always packed. It would be packed if the Nazis had to pay people to enter, for a packed hall suggests success. But it has not been necessary to pay them. Tonight Adolf Hitler, the LEADER, is speaking in person.

It is late. National Socialist meetings almost always begin a little late. It gives them greater importance. Suddenly military bands break into action, one to four of them, twenty to two hundred instruments, with plenty of trombones and reinforced drums—a military march. The doors farthest from the platform are thrown open and the party standards appear, large and gilded. Above the banners is a circle enclosing a swastika in bronze, and on the tops perch bronze eagles. In close formation, with studied solemnity, the standard-bearers move forward and group themselves below the platform. As they pass through the crowd a well-trained group of party members, under the guidance of an invisible conductor, break into a vast shout: "Hail! Hail! Hail!" It is contagious. Most of the crowd join in the third "Hail." Then, at the rear, behind a bodyguard of stiff-moving, extra-stalwart lads, a small group, generally in the traditional brown

MASS SUGGESTION

uniform, come the prominent leaders, for all the world like a general staff. And last, behind them, smiling as benignly as a victorious general reviewing his army, the LEADER, Adolf Hitler. No uniform. No airs here. Just like one of the crowd. A good sort! Pale tan raincoat, black shoes and socks, black suit and tie, white shirt, gold party pin in buttonhole, smooth dark hair and dark "Charlie Chaplin" moustaches on the upper lip.

Once more the audience breaks into shouts: *Ave Caesar Imperator!*

No, that is not what they are shouting but it might be. They are expressing their loyalty, their devotion, their faith unto death in the LEADER who is about to save Germany (really he is asking them for their votes and support—but you would never know it. By making them pay to enter, by his stagecraft and declarations and mass suggestions, the impression is actually created that it is they who are appealing to him. So far as I know, apart from a few successful revivalists, no one else in the contemporary world can do this.)

Silence is restored. The LEADER and his companions and his bodyguard have reached the platform. They are seated. One of the lesser lights arises to introduce the speaker. He begins in a friendly, matter-of-fact way to address the crowd. He takes it for granted that they all agree with him. His purpose is not to win votes (Oh, no!) but to inform them, the mass, whither the guides are leading them and how lucky they are to possess such guides.

It is highly-studied stuff though it sounds entirely casual. He takes them into his confidence, he shares political jokes with them for perhaps five minutes. Then suddenly, growing pathetic, he dwells upon their woes. They, their families, their Fatherland, all are in danger. Everything is for the worst in the worst of all countries. But it is not their fault, not the fault of this grandest of all peoples. Suddenly he grows savage and turns to them with a question: "What is responsible for our misery?"

Five hundred instructed party members reply in unison: "The system" (meaning the Weimar Constitution of 1918 and the Democratic Republic).

"Who is behind the System?"

"The Jews!"

It is like a catechism. And then:—

"What is Adolf Hitler to us?"

"A faith!"

"What else?"

"A last hope!"

"What else?"

"Our LEADER!"

Military bands crash a gigantic salute. Then the LEADER arises, stands silent for an impressive moment, and speaks in a rough but powerful voice. He speaks one hour, two hours, four hours. The crowd hang on his words. They have ceased to be beings with minds, they have become a single sounding-board for this man's music. If he stops they howl for more. He states—the most astonishing and totally inaccurate things. He roars, he pleads; if need be, he can weep. But he never analyses, discusses, or argues.

He affirms, attacks, comforts. According to his axiom of aiming at the lowest in his audience, he keeps to fixed generalities and catchwords, repeating them with infinite verve. At the same time he appeals to the personality of each class of hearer, of each hearer in person.

"Discussion of our programme is useless, my friends. Each of you already knows in his heart just what we shall do when we get into power!"

What balm to a miserable people that does nothing but murmur: "Something has to happen!" He alone promises that something will happen. How? Somewhat as follows:—

First. The National Socialists must come to power alone and smash the existing *System*. (Nothing can be expected of them so long as their power is not absolute.) *Then only* can they clear up the terrible ravages left by criminal and incapable Republicans. And *finally* (but without undue haste) the foundations will be laid for a society in which *everything will be different*—the Third Empire of the triumphant German!

Meanwhile he offers consolation to the wretched. "You," he says to his half-educated, despairing, bankrupt middle-class hearers, "are indeed poor devils, without national independence or fortune, without social consideration or source of income. *But it is not your fault that you lost the War and the peace!* You have been betrayed. Your country was mutilated. Your rightful claim to a greater territory for your many children is contested in the East by the lousy Poles; your industrial substance in the West is

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

being eaten away by Jew-ridden American financiers; your legitimate desire to rise in your might and sweep the vermin away awakens the brutality of your oppressors, the already semi-Negroid people of militaristic France.

"But remember that you are the greatest people on earth, the finest representatives of that Aryan race which God Almighty intended to rule the earth. What should you do? Obey me absolutely. Follow me, and your day will come as surely as tomorrow's sun!"

Do they follow? They do. Sceptics turn as fervent as seasoned party men. Down in the front row, adolescent girls sit tense, with the facial expression of those awaiting some supreme sensation. Young men feel their backs stiffen. Old people who have not smiled for months begin to glow. This is what they all needed to hear. Adolf Hitler alone is their comforter.

When he finally decides that they have had enough, and turns away to wipe the flowing sweat, and the bands burst out in a grand blare of military triumph, they sing their patriotic songs as never before, and disperse. To most of them the advent of the Third Empire is as certain as their own emotional exhaustion.

* * *

So, Mr. Mowrer adds, it went on night after night. Among the tens of thousands a few saw through it. These had expected to see a

superior being, and saw a man of worse physique than most of themselves—"face and head, bad; race, mongrel," to quote Professor von Gruber, Doctor of Medicine, President of the Bavarian Academy—a mediocre, awkward figure apparently made to stand behind a provincial shop counter. What the few saw was positively true. But what if 95 per cent of those present saw something different and sublime? Hitler, in his heart, is a ferocious reactionary—which did not prevent him from becoming the LEADER of millions whose nearest approach to a common idea was their hatred of capitalism. He first, among German politicians, felt the need of youth for sympathy and for the re-expression of old longings in language they could understand. He, too, skilfully fed the hostility of German Protestants towards the Catholics. Masterly was his appeal to women—not by promising them greater rights and concessions but by undertaking to relieve them of all share in public affairs, to take them out of offices and factories and to provide each and every one of them with a husband. Hitler, Mr. Mowrer adds—with an insight that lends especial point to Hitler's present asseverations of peaceful intent while he is drilling and preparing the youth of Germany for war—

collected his motley army by the trick of taking all their troubles upon his shoulders. "Though he preached doctrines which, if realised, would inevitably lead to European slaughter, he convinced the masses that he desired nothing so much as quiet and order and an end to political chaos. . . . In the great game of fooling the public he is an incomparable master."

The trick worked magnificently. At the Reichstag election in May 1924, Hitler's party, or the Party of German Racial Freedom as it then thought best to call itself, polled 1,918,310 votes or 6·5 per cent of the votes cast, and thus secured 32 seats in the Reichstag. True, in the following November, when the Dawes Reparation Plan had been accepted and the currency stabilised after disastrous inflation, the German Racial Freedom *movement* (no longer called a "Party") polled only 906,946 votes, or 3 per cent of the total, and got 14 seats in the Reichstag; and even three and a half years later, at the next Reichstag election in May 1928, the National Socialist German Workers' Party, or Nazis, as by that time they called themselves, got merely 809,541 votes and 12 seats. But then, after Dr. Brüning's ill-timed dissolution of the Reichstag, the Nazis polled 6,406,397 votes in the election of September

MASS SUGGESTION

1930, or 18·33 per cent of the votes cast, and got 107 seats. Dr. Brüning and his predecessors had tried deliberately to foster nationalism among the masses who, under influence of economic depression, concluded that the whole hog was better than a side of bacon and went over to Hitler. As Mr. Mowrer says, after the death of Stresemann the Government, perhaps deliberately, aided the progress of the Nazi party by accepting Hitler's arguments against the war treaties as its own. Then came the world depression that made the party really important. At the two ballots for the Presidency in March and April 1932, Hitler's candidature received 11,344,119 votes in the first, and 13,417,460 votes, or nearly 37 per cent of the total, in the second; and in the Reichstag election on July 31, 1932, his party vote rose to 13,733,000, or over 37 per cent of the total, and got 230 seats.

Thus had Hitler awakened Germany. He had some right to expect President Hindenburg to call him to power. But the old Junker President merely dismissed the politically inept Dr. Brüning, and put Captain von Papen, an ultra-conservative officer with industrial backing and somewhat chequered diplomatic antecedents, in his place; and when von Papen had

lost yet another election, the President replaced him by the "social general" von Schleicher, who offended the Prussian Junkers and the great industrialists alike by proposing to settle peasants upon some bankrupt Junker estates, and by flirting with the Trade Unions. Then Captain von Papen and Adolf Hitler came to terms, President von Hindenburg was persuaded to "send for" the Nazi leader, and, after a short period of hectic negotiation, during which rumours were artfully spread that General von Schleicher meant to arrest for high treason both Hitler and von Papen, Hitler swallowed the President's terms and was duly installed as Chancellor on January 30, 1933. That night hundreds of thousands of uniformed Nazis marched under the windows of the Chancellor's palace to celebrate the LEADER's triumph—and President von Hindenburg may well have wondered whether he had not opened the sluices to a flood which neither he nor any other Prussian Conservative would be able to dam back.

* * *

Thus, through mass suggestion playing upon a persecution mania which he himself had fostered—though all German parties and public

MASS SUGGESTION

men had helped to create it—did Adolf Hitler attain power. The Jews and the “Men of Weimar,” whom he had most consistently and persistently villified and denounced, began to tremble—as well they might. Had not Hitler promised that the Jews should be made to pay for their misdeeds, that there would be “a night of long knives” and that “heads would roll in the sand”? The scene was set for a pogrom and a massacre. If neither pogrom nor massacre took precisely the expected form, this was due in part to Hitler’s fear of the effects on public feeling abroad. So a more moderate and “colder” pogrom was arranged, with plentiful beatings, killings, and “suicidings,” which marked a definite stage in one of the most interesting and important international developments of this century—the divorce between Germanism and Jewry.

.

GERMANISM AND JEWRY

GERMANISM AND JEWRY

THE relations between Germanism and Jewry need to be examined from a much wider angle of vision than that of Hitlerism, on the one hand, and of anti-Hitlerism, on the other. No man, however impartial he may think himself, can hope to escape the charge of being biased if he attempts to survey a subject so vast and so intricate. It may therefore be well if I say how I came to study it and what warrant I have to speak of it at all.

Broadly, this warrant is derived from some forty years' continuous observation of the relations between Germans and Jews in several countries and under conditions not unfavourable to the formation of a considered judgment. When, in my twenty-second year, I went to Berlin University I did not realise that there might be a German-Jewish or, indeed, a Jewish problem. Jews I had met, though without attaching more significance to their physical and mental characteristics than to those of other people. But in the winter and spring of 1892-93 I attended many political

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

meetings in Berlin—Socialist, Liberal, Conservative, and others—mainly, I confess, because I wished to accustom my ear to the German language loudly spoken in public. Among these meetings was one organised by the famous, not to say notorious, Court Chaplain Stöcker, who attracted large audiences by the vigour of his diatribes against the Jews and by his obvious belief that, in denouncing them, he was acting as his hero, Martin Luther, would have acted; and he always ended by demanding that they should be bundled off to Palestine and leave the German people in peace.

So unbecoming in a Christian pastor did these fulminations seem that I called upon Court Chaplain Stöcker to put what he doubtless thought were impertinent questions. I found him sitting below a bust of Martin Luther and posing so as to bring out the facial resemblance between him and the chief parent of the German Reformation. He treated me not only to a private denunciation of the Jews but to an indignant harangue against England, a Jew-ridden country, unconsciously enslaved to Jewish finance, enslaved to such an extent that he, Court Chaplain Stöcker, had been prevented from hiring any large hall

in London for an anti-Jewish meeting. As I left the reverend gentleman I remember wondering whether his views upon Jewry in Germany could be altogether sound, seeing that his views upon England were based upon what struck me as slightly inadequate data.

Still, Court Chaplain Stöcker was by no means alone. A daily antisemitic paper, the *Staatsbürger Zeitung*, was published in Berlin at that time and was widely read. Even the *Kreuz Zeitung*, the organ of true-blue Prussian evangelical Conservatism, had a strong anti-Jewish flavour; and an agitator named Ahlwardt, whose language might have served as a model for that of Herr Hitler, was writing scurrilous pamphlets and speaking to crowded meetings against the Jews and their misdeeds. Ahlwardt even got himself elected to the Reichstag on the strength of his denunciations. These circumstances induced me to look into the German-Jewish question more seriously and to seek enlightenment from Jewish and non-Jewish friends.

Among others I approached the Jewish Treasurer of the German Democratic Social Party, Paul Singer, who informed me that antisemitism was merely a form of anti-capitalist agitation, since the Jews were the

HITLER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

foremost representatives of the capitalist system, and that everything would come right as soon as the triumph of the Socialist Revolution had put an end to capitalism itself. I regret to say that this explanation convinced me as little as the assurances of Court Chaplain Stöcker had done.

For some years in France, again in Germany, and afterwards in Italy, I kept an eye on the Jewish problem, hoping to find a clear path through the assertions and counter-assertions which befogged it. It was during this period that the Dreyfus affair began and ran its course. This affair, it may perhaps not be superfluous to say, arose out of the condemnation of Captain Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish staff officer in the French army, on a charge of having betrayed important military secrets to Germany. Despite his protestations of innocence Dreyfus was sentenced to life-long confinement in a tropical penal settlement, known as "Devil's Island," on the strength of a secret and—as it turned out to be—a forged document which was shown neither to him nor to his counsel. A fierce agitation presently arose over the question of his guilt. For years it split parties, classes, and even families in France into two pugnacious factions. Jewish

organisations throughout the world took up and supported their co-religionist's case. In the long run, however, the case was won and the innocence of Dreyfus established less by this Jewish support than by the moral heroism of Frenchmen like Emile Zola, Colonel Picquart, Jaurès, Anatole France, and many others. Thanks to their efforts enough evidence was obtained to warrant a revision of the Dreyfus trial by a military court at Rennes in 1899; and though the Court, influenced by the idea that the honour of the army was at stake, refused to acquit Dreyfus, the agitation went on in a milder form until he was "amnes-tied" and, at the beginning of the Great War, reinstated in the army.

During the course of this affair I saw, both in France and at Rome, that the Catholic hierarchy, the religious orders, including the Jesuits, and clerical organisations in general, were thoroughly hostile to Dreyfus, perhaps because international Freemasonry was on his side. The Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla, went so far as to express to M. Sazonof, who was then the representative of Russia at the Holy See, his deep satisfaction at the refusal of the Military Court at Rennes to acquit Captain Dreyfus of treason—though

foremost representatives of the capitalist system, and that everything would come right as soon as the triumph of the Socialist Revolution had put an end to capitalism itself. I regret to say that this explanation convinced me as little as the assurances of Court Chaplain Stöcker had done.

For some years in France, again in Germany, and afterwards in Italy, I kept an eye on the Jewish problem, hoping to find a clear path through the assertions and counter-assertions which befogged it. It was during this period that the Dreyfus affair began and ran its course. This affair, it may perhaps not be superfluous to say, arose out of the condemnation of Captain Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish staff officer in the French army, on a charge of having betrayed important military secrets to Germany. Despite his protestations of innocence Dreyfus was sentenced to life-long confinement in a tropical penal settlement, known as "Devil's Island," on the strength of a secret and—as it turned out to be—a forged document which was shown neither to him nor to his counsel. A fierce agitation presently arose over the question of his guilt. For years it split parties, classes, and even families in France into two pugnacious factions. Jewish

organisations throughout the world took up and supported their co-religionist's case. In the long run, however, the case was won and the innocence of Dreyfus established less by this Jewish support than by the moral heroism of Frenchmen like Emile Zola, Colonel Picquart, Jaurès, Anatole France, and many others. Thanks to their efforts enough evidence was obtained to warrant a revision of the Dreyfus trial by a military court at Rennes in 1899; and though the Court, influenced by the idea that the honour of the army was at stake, refused to acquit Dreyfus, the agitation went on in a milder form until he was "amnestied" and, at the beginning of the Great War, reinstated in the army.

During the course of this affair I saw, both in France and at Rome, that the Catholic hierarchy, the religious orders, including the Jesuits, and clerical organisations in general, were thoroughly hostile to Dreyfus, perhaps because international Freemasonry was on his side. The Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla, went so far as to express to M. Sazonof, who was then the representative of Russia at the Holy See, his deep satisfaction at the refusal of the Military Court at Rennes to acquit Captain Dreyfus of treason—though

it granted him "extenuating circumstances"—and M. Sazonof earned the Cardinal's displeasure by replying that in Russia the behaviour of the Rennes tribunal was looked upon as outrageous. Of Dreyfus's innocence I had good reason to be convinced, for I knew that the documents which he was supposed to have sold to Germany had, in reality, been supplied to her by an unquestionably Christian traitor of quite another name, and had then been communicated to the Italian War Office. If observation of the Dreyfus affair convinced me that the roots of the Jewish question go deep into the very foundations of the social and political structure in Europe, it was not until I went, at the end of 1902, to Vienna, where I was to work for more than ten years, that the intense, albeit narrower, significance of that question in Central Europe was borne in upon me. In the Austrian capital, and still more at Budapest, the capital of Hungary, the Jews were omnipresent, save in the uppermost circles of society. They controlled the greater part of the Press, the banks, and the business world. In the theatre and in music little or nothing could be done without them; and in Austria, at least, they were very German and pro-German, not to say pan-

GERMANISM AND JEWRY

German. Even in Hungary, where many of them had Magyarised their names and were among the fiercest of Magyar chauvinists, their pro-Germanism was hardly less evident. Neither there nor in Austria was it possible to ignore the Jewish question. Dr. Lueger, the antisemitic Burgomaster of Vienna, and the pan-German Press saw to that. And the unblushing pro-Germanism of the Jewish liberal Press, with the *Neue Freie Presse* at its head, compelled the most indifferent observer to ask why it was that the Jews who were, on the whole, better treated in Austria than they were in Germany, should love the Hohenzollern Empire with so persistent and aggressive a love.

I put this question to my many Jewish friends in Vienna, without ever eliciting a wholly satisfactory answer. One of them, an Austrian Jew from Galicia, in whose family Polish was spoken instead of German or Yiddish, replied simply: "It is because the Jews are stupid." At first this reply seemed ridiculous. If there is one thing on which the Jews, as a race, pride themselves, it is their intelligence; and to attribute stupidity to them sounded like blasphemy. Is there not a Yiddish saying: "The Lord preserve us from Gentile

force and Jewish brains"? Yet, on reflection, I came to see what my friend meant. His meaning was that there is a stage at which intellectual pride or sentimental tenacity approaches dull-wittedness; and it has sometimes been wickedly suggested that the conduct which Shakespeare attributes to Shylock in the *Merchant of Venice* is a case in point. Shylock was undoubtedly within his strict right; but even as a business man he behaved stupidly, for he failed to perceive the cash value of the quality of mercy.

From another Austrian Jew, a learned Rabbi, I got a different explanation. It was to the effect that, according to Jewish legend, the German, Polish, and Russian Jews—who are called Ashkenazim, as distinguished from the Sephardim, or Western, Spanish, and Portuguese Jews—were pro-German for historical and linguistic reasons. After the fall of Jerusalem, he said, the Romans transported large numbers of the Jewish populace to distant regions of the Roman Empire, thousands of them being sent as slaves to a German region on the Upper Rhine. This region was known as Ascania, after the name of its Governor, Ascanius. Hence the term "Ashkenazim." In course of time the Hebrew

speech of these Ascanian or Ashkenazim Jews was affected by the German tongue of the people among whom they lived, and acquired the semi-German character which marks the Yiddish, or Jüdisch, jargon. In later centuries, persecution by robber barons of the Rhineland led most of these Jews to accept the asylum offered them by the Kings of Poland. In Poland, however, they continued to speak Yiddish, and to look upon the German language as most nearly akin to their own.

Whatever the value of this theory, in which the learned Rabbi may have mingled fact and fancy—for it is a fact that the Kings of Poland gave asylum to persecuted Jews from Germany—the Austrian Jews were undeniably pro-German, so much so that they gave their children high-sounding German, and especially Wagnerian, names. An Austrian wag, Count Adalbert Sternberg, once sent the Chamber of Deputies into fits of laughter by exclaiming that the name “Siegmund” had become a Jewish racial designation! But of other explanations of Jewish pro-Germanism there was no lack, one of them being that, after the German victory over France in 1870-71, the Jews believed Germany to be the rising Power, and consequently sought to “back the

winner." This idea was strongly held by non-German antisemites who ascribed Jewish pro-Germanism to the belief that, in the Greater Germany of the future, which was to extend from Hamburg to Baghdad, the Jews would hold a monopoly of finance and trade.

To me it seemed that some impulse more subtle than the expectation of material advantage was needed to account for the Ashkenazim love of Germany, and to explain why the number of Jews in Austria who identified themselves with the Slav majority of the country should be so small. Hatred of persecuting Russia, and of pan-Slavism, may have explained it in part, for Germany was the foe of pan-Slavism. In any event the Jews who migrated to Vienna from the Slav regions of Austria-Hungary straightway claimed German "nationality," that is to say, racial allegiance as distinguished from Austrian citizenship. When Germanic Germans disowned them, these Jews were wont to reply that they "felt like Germans," an assertion which the Germanic Germans passionately denied. I knew of one instance in which a young Jew from Bohemia committed suicide, after writing beautiful lyrics in German, because it dawned

upon him that, try as he would, he could never acquire a really "Germanic soul."

* * *

This was the state of things in Austria during the early years of the century, about the time when Adolf Hitler's outlook was being coloured by his surroundings in Vienna and by the influences I have already described. Hitler says in *Mein Kampf* that it was the rise and growth of the Zionist movement which convinced him of the incompatibility of Jewish aspirations with true Germanism, and confirmed him in his feeling that the Jewish question was one of race, not of religion. Here, for once in a way, I do not altogether disagree with Hitler. Nowadays, at all events, it is more a question of race than of religion; and this circumstance tends to place the Jewish problem, both in itself and in its relation to Germanism, upon a footing that alters the terms of the problem.

For centuries the persecution of the Jews, and Jewish resistance to it, had been inspired, or cloaked, mainly by religious considerations. I say "cloaked" because economic motives played a part. Thus it certainly was in Russia, where the Jews were abominably persecuted

winner." This idea was strongly held by non-German antisemites who ascribed Jewish pro-Germanism to the belief that, in the Greater Germany of the future, which was to extend from Hamburg to Baghdad, the Jews would hold a monopoly of finance and trade.

To me it seemed that some impulse more subtle than the expectation of material advantage was needed to account for the Ashkenazim love of Germany, and to explain why the number of Jews in Austria who identified themselves with the Slav majority of the country should be so small. Hatred of persecuting Russia, and of pan-Slavism, may have explained it in part, for Germany was the foe of pan-Slavism. In any event the Jews who migrated to Vienna from the Slav regions of Austria-Hungary straightway claimed German "nationality," that is to say, racial allegiance as distinguished from Austrian citizenship. When Germanic Germans disowned them, these Jews were wont to reply that they "felt like Germans," an assertion which the Germanic Germans passionately denied. I knew of one instance in which a young Jew from Bohemia committed suicide, after writing beautiful lyrics in German, because it dawned

upon him that, try as he would, he could never acquire a really "Germanic soul."

* * *

This was the state of things in Austria during the early years of the century, about the time when Adolf Hitler's outlook was being coloured by his surroundings in Vienna and by the influences I have already described. Hitler says in *Mein Kampf* that it was the rise and growth of the Zionist movement which convinced him of the incompatibility of Jewish aspirations with true Germanism, and confirmed him in his feeling that the Jewish question was one of race, not of religion. Here, for once in a way, I do not altogether disagree with Hitler. Nowadays, at all events, it is more a question of race than of religion; and this circumstance tends to place the Jewish problem, both in itself and in its relation to Germanism, upon a footing that alters the terms of the problem.

For centuries the persecution of the Jews, and Jewish resistance to it, had been inspired, or cloaked, mainly by religious considerations. I say "cloaked" because economic motives played a part. Thus it certainly was in Russia, where the Jews were abominably persecuted

in the nineteenth century, and where pogroms, or "lightning massacres," took place without the disapproval if not with the connivance of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church. In defending themselves against and denouncing these persecutions, the Jews throughout the world took their stand on religious ground. Even when Jews were suspected or convicted of economic or financial malpractices, it was usual for their co-religionists to attribute to religious intolerance the animosity that was shown towards them. But after the rise of the Zionist movement a noticeable change occurred. The Jewish question came to be looked upon by many Jews, as well as by non-Jews, as rather a question of race than of religion; and it is noteworthy that, in all the ill-treatment to which the Jews have been subjected in Hitlerite Germany, the religious issue has not once been prominently raised. This is in accordance with Hitler's own doctrine. For the first time in the modern world the Jewish problem has been dealt with mainly as a race problem, whatever the underlying social and economic motives may be.

Those who, like me, have witnessed the regenerating influence of the Zionist ideal

upon the Jewish masses cannot regret that Jewry should stand forth as an ethnic unit. When Theodore Herzl, then the Literary Editor of the *Neue Freie Presse* of Vienna, started the Zionist movement towards the end of last century, the younger intellectual Jews of Austria-Hungary, and also in Germany, were at the parting of the ways. Contact with the outer world had deprived many of them of the faith of their fathers, and had stripped their minds of the grosser Talmudic wrappings which had enswathed them in their Ghettos, without giving them any other idealism or reasons for faith. In consequence many cultured Jewish youths showed a scepticism that grew increasingly cynical. Some became openly revolutionary. Others sought to merge themselves in Germanism—and were rebuffed. To such as these Zionism came with the force of an evangel. To be a Jew and to be proud of it; to glory in the power and pertinacity of the race, its traditions, its sufferings, its resistance to persecution; to look the world frankly in the face, and to enjoy the luxury of moral and intellectual candour; to feel pride in belonging to the people that gave to Christianity its Deities and taught monotheism to half the world, a people whose ideas had

permeated civilisation as hardly ever, if ever, the ideas of a race before it; whose genius fashioned the mechanism of modern trade and finance, and whose artists, actors, singers, and writers had filled a larger place than those of any other single folk—these and similar emotions awoke in youthful Jews a sense of race-worthiness and self-reliance that had long been outwardly lacking.

This new state of mind was soon visible among the Jewish students of Austrian universities. Until then they had been despised and often ill-treated. They had wormed their way into official appointments and into the free professions by dint of pliancy, apostasy, mock humility, mental acuteness, and secret protection. If struck or spat upon by "Aryan" students, they had rarely dared to return the blow or the insult. But Zionism gave them courage. They formed associations, practised athletic drill, and became expert swordsmen. Presently the best fencers of the fighting corps among the German students found that Zionist students could chop scalps or gash cheeks as skilfully as any Teuton. Then the purple caps of the Zionists came to be as respected as those of the most authentic "Aryan" blood-letters.

Equally noticeable was the influence of Zionism upon the masses of Jewry, not excluding those in the Jewish quarters (or Ghettos) of towns where Jew exploited Jew, and where contempt of the Gentile had done duty for self-respect. Naturally the elder generations, within the Ghettos and without, looked upon Zionism with misgiving. They feared that, by coming out into the open, the Zionists would play into Gentile hands. Little more than a year before the War, on March 29, 1913, an influential German-Jewish association, the "Central Society of German Citizens of Jewish Faith," adopted a strongly anti-Zionist resolution which ran: "The Society demands of its members not only the fulfilment of their duties as citizens, but German feelings and the exercise of those feelings in civil life. . . . On the soil of the German Fatherland we wish, as Germans, to co-operate in German civilisation and to remain true to a partnership that has been hallowed by religion and history. In so far as the Zionist endeavours to provide an assured home for the Jews of the East who are deprived of their rights, or to increase the pride of Jews in their history and religion, he is welcome to us as a member; but we must sever ourselves from the Zionist who denies

German national (that is to say, racial) sentiments, feels himself to be a guest among a strange people, and only feels nationally (that is to say, racially) as a Jew."

This statement was naturally published with every sign of approval by the *Neue Freie Presse* of Vienna, an organ which combined passionate pro-Germanism and effective pan-Germanism with an assimilationist Jewish policy and with vigorous defence of Jewish business interests. But it hardly spoke for the younger Jews who revolted inwardly against assimilation, and denounced assimilationist doctrine. One learned young Zionist did not hesitate to tax assimilationist Jewish historians with mendacity for having suggested that the Talmud, the central organ into which the sap of Jewry has flowed since Biblical times, and has worked the unprecedented miracle of keeping a landless people mentally and physically healthy throughout the centuries, is a mere excrescence raised on the body of Jewry by stress of untoward circumstances. These historians, he continued, have sought to show that the Jews who remained true to tradition, the overwhelming majority of the nation, are degenerates from type; that the Ghetto, the segregation necessary for the

preservation of the type, the Ghetto in which the Jews have always lived since their entrance into history, is an invention of the peoples in whose midst they have dwelt; and that the Jewish martyrdom, the inevitable consequence of voluntary segregation, has, at all times and in all places, been due to Gentile brutality. Finally, concluded the young Zionist, these modern Jewish historians have removed the name of Jewry from the list of nations and have made it out to be a mere group of human beings bound together solely by ties of religion, whereas it is, above all, a race and a nation.

For better or for worse the Zionist movement took a long step forward when, in November 1917, the late Lord Balfour, as British Foreign Secretary, issued his famous declaration in favour of the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine. The wisdom of that declaration has often been challenged, and in some quarters is challenged even today. Without entering now into the reasons for it, with which I was well acquainted at the time, I wish only to say that they were politically and morally cogent, and that, apart from their rightness or wrongness, no stroke of British policy was felt by Germany

to have been shrewder than the British espousal of the Jewish national cause. Nor do I wish to enquire what connection, if any, there may be between the present German onslaught upon Jewry and the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. German antisemitism, as I have shown, had long been a rank and a rancorous growth. In 1913, more than a year before the War, a German writer, who called himself "Daniel Frymann," published at Munich a book entitled *Wenn ich der Kaiser Wär* (If I Were Emperor). Hitler, who was then at Munich, may well have read it. It ran through a dozen editions in a few weeks. Its author declared that, if he were the Kaiser, he would immediately expel all Jews not possessing German citizenship; degrade to the status of tolerated aliens all Jews and descendants of Jews, whether of pure blood or mixed, who possessed German citizenship and had been registered as Jews in 1871; exclude Jews, baptised and unbaptised, from all public offices, the legal profession, the army and navy, the directorships of banks and theatres, the ownership and editorship of newspapers, and journalism in general. In addition, he would deprive Jews of the franchise, of eligibility to Parliament, of the

right to own land or to lend money on landed mortgages, and would levy upon them, as aliens, double taxation. It was a question, he exclaimed, of "saving the German soul!"

The anti-Jewish decrees issued and enforced by the Hitlerite Government in Germany since last spring suggest that these recommendations may have been taken as its official programme. I was reminded of them some two years ago when Herr Hitler's chief representative in London called upon me to explain that Hitler had no intention of "pogroming" the Jews but intended merely to deprive German Jews of all their civil rights. I enquired whether Hitler had consulted the Jews about the difference, and was assured that there was a great difference between an inhuman pogrom and the more humane treatment which Hitler contemplated. So I fear I retorted: "Yes, deprive them of all civil rights first, and 'pogrom,' or squeeze the life out of them afterwards when they will have no means of redress."

* * *

On the one hand we have therefore the idea, which Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf*, and the whole Nazi literature loudly proclaim, that

the "German soul" must be saved from the insidious and corrupting influence of Jewry; and, on the other, a question of human right, irrespective of race or religion. Only those who deny that the Jews are human beings or, at any rate, human beings of "Aryan" rank, can admit the thesis that, in order to save the soul of a hypothetically superior race, they must be treated as helots if not as the scum of the earth. To my weak mind there seems to be an inherent contradiction between the claim that—to quote once more the Nazi Minister of Justice, Dr. Frank—"the blood-substance of the Germanic race constitutes so pre-eminent and unique an asset of the world as a whole that we should be justified in counting it the duty of the entire human race, in thankfulness, to safeguard this basic Germanic element," and the implication that this precious Germanic blood is so feeble a fluid that only the most drastic protective measures can save it from dire pollution. Or are Germanic Germans jealous of the Jewish belief that Jewry is the "chosen race," the salt of the earth, selected by Jehovah for the highest human mission, and do they therefore wish to set up Germanic "Aryans" as a counter-"chosen race" entrusted by Odin with a

sublimier mission—that of establishing by the sword the lofty rule of Nordic heroes over the lesser breeds of mankind? I may be guilty of deep impiety in both directions, for I am incorrigibly sceptical about “chosen races” of any sort, and am not even disposed to bow down in speechless awe before “God’s Englishmen.” There is a rough saying in my native East Anglia, “Handsome is as handsome does”; and this, I think, sums up my creed on race problems.

* * *

Yet Hitlerite treatment of the German Jews raises a formidable issue. Is there no justification for the conduct of a party and a Government in killing, ostracising, and reducing to effective servitude the members of a race which, whatever its shortcomings, has in the past rendered immeasurable services to Germany? If we accept the Hitlerite assertions—assertions deliberately unweakened by any attempt at analysis or proof—we may admit that the indictment is forcible. It is, moreover, an indictment that cannot be dis-severed from the doctrine of “Aryan” Germanism on which it is based. We need to face it squarely; and in so doing to remember that

its main postulate, that of "Aryan" Nordic superiority, may be utterly unfounded. On this point one of the leading authorities, if not the highest authority, upon prehistorical archaeology in Great Britain, Professor Gordon Childe of the University of Edinburgh, wrote an important letter to *The Times* last July. He declared that, scientifically, all the talk about an "Aryan race" is arrant nonsense. Three thousand years before the Christian era, he added, the Sumerians, the Egyptians, and the nameless but certainly pre-Aryan people of the Indus Valley,

created the civilisation of which, through the Greeks and the Romans, and by more devious channels, we are the heirs. And by civilisation I mean not simply material culture . . . but also political organisation and science.

At the date in question the ancestors of the Germans and Anglo-Saxons were filthy savages picking up shellfish on the shores of the Baltic. There is not a trace of Aryan elements in any sense . . . among the creators of civilised life. It is indeed doubtful whether the people who spoke the Aryan tongue were yet in existence when the oriental civilisations were founded.

. . . Aryan, originally, was a linguistic term and denoted the speakers of a certain group of languages. No less an authority than Max Müller pointed out that to speak of an Aryan race was as absurd as to

talk of a brachycephalic (or broad-skulled) dictionary. Languages are characteristic of peoples—groups united by community of tradition and culture but not necessarily of blood. Race, on the contrary, is a physical term. Nazi “philosophy” confuses these two distinct concepts. Distortions of the science of pre-history in Germany have to some extent encouraged this confusion. That is perhaps sufficient excuse for a professor of pre-history in Great Britain to insist upon the distinction.

Now the fundamental idea of the Hitlerite movement is that the pre-eminent position to which Germany has a right in the world can be assured only by a return to the Nordic purity of its “Aryan” origin. The Hitlerite “Third Empire” (as distinguished from the First, or Holy Roman Empire—of which Voltaire naughtily said that it was neither Holy nor Roman nor an Empire—and from the Second, or Hohenzollern, Empire of 1871-1918) must be founded solely upon race, and must unite in one realm all human beings of German race, and none but these. This community of blood, sole source of national energy, is what the Hitlerites mean by “Volkstum.” The “Volkstum,” the Germanic blood-community, comprises everything that is authentically German and unites the vital forces of the race.

This supreme treasure of the Germanic race, pure "Aryan" blood, the international forces represented by the Jews are accused of striving, with diabolical skill and tenacity, to destroy. Among their foulest ideas Hitler enumerates those of Parliamentary Democracy and of human equality. The German "Aryan" principle is, *ex hypothesi*, aristocratic, since the Aryan race is an aristocracy among races and therefore entitled to rule the world. Inasmuch as Christianity is adulterated by many false conceptions, it is necessary to Germanise Christianity. In 1924, the Germanic "Aryan" writer, von Wendrin, discovered that the mystery behind the Christian Scriptures is that Christ (whose name should be written "Krist") is none other than the Scandinavian deity, Baldur. Notions like these explain the recent subjugation of the Protestant German Churches by a Hitlerite group known as "German Christians"—against whom three thousand Protestant pastors, under the leadership of their elected Bishop, Dr. von Bodelschwingh, have been in revolt. These dissentient pastors hold, with St. Paul, that in Christianity there is no place for racial discrimination, "neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond

nor free," whereas the "German Christians" maintain that baptism alone is not enough to make a German Christian unless he is an authentic "Aryan," and that the Jewish spirit must disappear from Christianity, the Old Testament being put into the distant background and the New Testament reduced to a Nazi version of the Gospel according to St. Mark. The ideal, which the "German Christians" have already sought to realise, would be to replace the Cross by the Swastika. In fact, the "Aryan" Germanic Christian doctrine goes to prove that the "Aryan race" and the primitive religion of the Germans (who represent that race) alone embody the true spirit of Christianity.

From these premises the Hitlerite indictment of the Jews naturally follows. In the Jew all the elements inimical to Germanic idealism are bound up. His critical and sceptical spirit undermines every healthy principle. He is the supreme Marxist whose international heresy foments revolutions and the ruin of States, so that he may enrich himself with the spoils. He, too, is the supreme capitalist, greedy of gain, careless of the people's needs. Without real roots in any land, he is a ubiquitous and agile parasite, the creator of a false art, of a

falsely objective science, and the destroyer of culture. He is the enemy of the human race, the enemy of God Himself, the enemy of the Light, the cloud that hides from the "Aryan" race the Sun which is its symbol.

Some may think I exaggerate. If so, they have but to study current Nazi literature or, in default of time to do this, to read Mr. Edgar Mowrer's chapter "Perish the Jew!" in his book *Germany Puts The Clock Back*. The Nazi song-book for the Storm Troops contains several samples, one of which runs:—

So stand the storm battalions
Ready for racial fight,
Only when Jews lie bleeding,
Can we be truly free.

Another and most popular refrain sung by Nazi students is:—

Wenn's Judenblut vom Messer spritzt,
Dann geht's nochmal so gut.
(When Jewish blood spurts from the knife
Then things go twice as well.)

Or, to cite the elegant language of Count Ernst zu Reventlow, a noble Nordic Nazi Prussian, "The Jew is the tapeworm in the human organism, and it is our duty to exterminate him."

The professing Jews in Germany number 565,000, or less than 1 per cent of the total population. What have these 565,000 or, for that matter—if the baptised and assimilated Jews and Jewesses of Germany and their descendants be added—the million or two million German Jews, to say in self-defence? Roughly, they plead the signal services they have rendered Germany where they have been established since the fourth century, at latest. Jews were present at the Court of Charlemagne in the eighth and ninth centuries and had permission to build synagogues and keep their own cemeteries. Though, during the Middle Ages, and through the Renaissance and the Reformation, full citizen rights were withheld from them, the reforms at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries gave them full equality, and the Prussian Edict of 1847, as well as the Constitution of the North German Confederation in 1869, confirmed it.

So far from being a growing danger to the German people the proportion of Jews to Germans has decreased during the past fifty or sixty years. Even in the chief cities, where the Jews mostly live, it fell, for instance, at Hamburg from 4·5 per cent of the population

in 1866 to 1.75 in 1925. Likewise in Berlin the Jewish proportion was 5.5 per cent in 1871 and only 4.3 per cent in 1925. Since the Jews were long debarred from the ownership of land, and in the Middle Ages non-Jews were forbidden to lend money on interest, it was natural that the Jews should have taken refuge in urban pursuits such as trade and money-lending. But as soon as the German guilds of craftsmen ceased to have a monopoly of craftsmanship, thousands of Jews became craftsmen and have long possessed a Craftsman's Association of their own. As for the alleged monopolisation of trade by big Jewish businesses, the great majority of Jewish concerns belong to one man or his family, and the proportion of such concerns to those owned by non-Jews is at most 6 per cent.

If it be claimed that the Hohenzollern Empire was dominated by Jews or by descendants of Jews, the truth is that a few baptised Jews or men of Jewish extraction did hold high administrative or ministerial positions, but that, as a rule, they were debarred from official careers, and, except in Bavaria, were not allowed to be officers in the army. It was only during the War that some Jews were promoted to commissioned rank. In the War

12,000 German Jews gave their lives for their country, or 12·5 per cent of their military numbers as compared with 13·49 per cent for the German people as a whole, the difference of percentage being explained by the circumstance that the greater part of the German army was recruited from rural districts, whereas the Jews are mainly urban. Altogether 100,000 of the 565,000 German Jews were in the army. 78,000 served at the front, 35,000 were decorated, 23,000 promoted, more than 2,000 (exclusive of army doctors) were given commissioned rank, and of these officers 322, or 16 per cent, fell in the field. 11 per cent of the Jewish soldiers were volunteers. Soon after the War the editor of an antisemitic paper at Munich offered a prize of one thousand marks to anybody who could prove that there was even one Jewish family with three sons in the trenches for three weeks. Thereupon a Rabbi of Hanover furnished a list of twenty Jewish families in his community that had fulfilled this condition, and a further list of fifty Jewish families from other communities which had had seven or eight sons in the field, some of them having had to mourn the loss of three of these.

The pretension that, under the German

Republic established in November 1918, the Jews held leading positions, is shown to be baseless by the fact that in all the German Cabinets, from the end of 1918 up to the advent of Hitlerism on January 30th of last year, there were 250 Ministers of whom two were Jews and only four of Jewish extraction. The proportion of Jews in the Administration of Justice was 1·2 per cent. Among professors in universities and high schools it was 4·7 per cent; and if it be claimed that the percentages were much higher in the medical and legal professions, it must be remembered that for centuries the Jews had been attracted to medicine because they were excluded from other professions, just as many of them became lawyers because other learned callings were practically closed to them. Among actors and musicians the percentage may have been as high as five. Politically the Jews belonged to all parties, except the antisemitic parties, but they were never predominant in Parliament. Out of 608 members elected to the Reichstag in July 1932 there were only one Jew and fourteen of Jewish extraction. Among the Socialist leaders very few were Jews.

The Hitlerite charge that, after the War, thousands of Polish, Russian, and other Eastern

Jews invaded Germany and demoralised German trade and economic life by their malpractices, cannot be substantiated in view of the fact that only 12,000 Eastern Jews, out of the 150,000 or 160,000 who fled from Russia or the border States into Germany after the War, were granted German citizenship and acquired the right to remain in Germany. Besides, General Ludendorff himself had appealed to the Polish Jews in his famous manifesto of 1914. The manifesto began "My Dear Jews," and declared that German banners would bring them justice and liberty, equality of civil rights, freedom of faith, freedom of work undisturbed in all branches of economic and cultural life, and that Germany would develop equal rights for the Jews upon firm foundations—a seductive promise that did not prevent the German Military Command in Russian Poland from deporting thousands of Jews to Germany during the War to do forced labour in the mines, especially in the Ruhr district, where they were obliged to remain.

* * *

On many points, though perhaps not on all, this Jewish defence is cogent. Stronger still is it in recalling the services rendered to

Germany by men like Walter Rathenau, who organised the German supply of war materials during the War, and professor Franz Haber, the great chemist who produced nitrogen from the air, without which Germany would soon have run short of explosives. In sober truth the Hitlerite indictment of the German Jews is coloured by the blackest ingratitude. It leaves entirely out of account the persistent pro-German propaganda which was long carried on even after the War—and, as I think, misguidedly and short-sightedly—by Jews all over the world. In fact they behaved as though Germany were their spiritual home, and her interests their interests. I personally have a vivid recollection of the desperate efforts made by very influential Jews of German origin in London, at the end of July and the beginning of August 1914, to bring about British neutrality in the Great War, and to convince not only newspaper proprietors but Ministers that, should Great Britain venture to oppose Germany, the British Empire would swiftly be swept off the face of the earth!

In speaking of what I have called the misguided and shortsighted Jewish propaganda in favour of Germany since the War, I have

in mind especially the pervasive campaign against the "war guilt lie" and for the revision of Peace Treaties, particularly for the abolition of the Polish Corridor. This propaganda, and the echoes it stirred up in the United States, this country, and elsewhere, did not a little to convince the German people that their country had indeed been guiltless of all responsibility for the War, and was therefore the victim of outrageous injustice. The spread of this sense of injustice helped in its turn to foster in Germany the persecution mania which Hitler has known so well how to turn against the Jews themselves. The result, as Mr. Edgar Mowrer truly says, has been the conclusion that "Since they (the Germans) lost the War, since they were poor and weary and bewildered, since they had been taught to believe themselves a wronged and humiliated nation, the question inevitably arose, how could such a situation come to be? No people likes to admit its own failings. Where, therefore, could the responsibility be put, if not on the Jew in their midst, the hateful foreign body in the otherwise flawless German organism? In short, the suffering German hated the Jew rather than see himself as he was."

According to my informant, Göring's arguments prevailed. It was all the easier for the Nazis to give this colour to their persecution because Russian Bolshevism, however strong or weak Jewish influence upon it may have been, has not been precisely careful of individual human right, or tender towards the Russian upper and middle classes or even towards the Russian people and their religion. And it is a fact, which no impartial observer can gainsay, that a high proportion of Jewish journals and Jewish writers in other countries have shown marked sympathy with Russian Bolshevism and with Communism in general. Indeed, not a few Jews have seemed disposed to turn their backs upon the principles of Western liberal civilisation, in the name of which they were emancipated during the nineteenth century, and to have allied themselves with systems or doctrines inspired by political or economic intolerance. Notable among such doctrines are those of "class warfare" and of "the dictatorship of the proletariat."

These things should give the Jews, and the non-Jews who most abhor Hitlerism and all its works, much food for thought. Should this thought lead to the conclusion that there can

be no safety for Europe, or for Western liberal civilisation, save under systems built upon respect for individual human right, irrespective of class, race, or creed, and providing for the equality of all citizens before the law, the present conflict between Germanism and Jewry may yet foster human progress and redound to the welfare of Jewry itself.

THE THIRD EMPIRE AND
THE TOTALITARIAN STATE

THE THIRD EMPIRE AND THE
TOTALITARIAN STATE

HITLERITE Germany, or "The Third Empire" as it is currently called, represents a challenge to Western liberal civilisation. Few things seem to me of higher moment than the safeguarding of this civilisation and of the principles upon which it has been built up. Of these principles the Nazi "Aryan" doctrine and its denial of democratic rule are a direct negation. The issue is now fairly joined between two incompatible systems and philosophies. Upon the outcome of this contest the fate of Europe and of Western liberal civilisation may depend.

What do we mean by "Western liberal civilisation"? We call it "Western" because it arose mainly in the West of Europe and in the United States of America, and because it is fundamentally at variance with the Eastern and Asiatic civilisations in which potentates, at their arbitrary discretion, hold, or held, absolute power over the lives, liberties, and belongings of their subjects. We call it "liberal"

because it is based on the liberal idea that power and authority come by delegation from the people, not from the Divine right of any ruler. According to this liberal idea "The State" is the bestowal of administrative and governing functions upon men or bodies of men chosen by a community for this purpose and acting as trustees for the common weal.

Liberal civilisation postulates further a wide measure of individual freedom, including freedom of thought, meeting, speech, and belief, and the toleration of opinions not held by the majority so long as these opinions are expressed in forms which do not transgress the law. In this respect the nineteenth century was markedly liberal, for it was characterised by growing toleration and by the removal of many legal disabilities from members of religious and intellectual minorities. Indeed, the underlying assumption of Western liberal civilisation is that, if thought be free, consciences unconstrained, and speech untrammelled, a civilised community will, at moments of stress or danger, find itself substantially united upon all essential matters.

Naturally such a civilisation demands a high level of mental and moral vigour on the part of the individual members of a free community.

It takes for granted their readiness to combine, in self-reliant devotion, for the defence of the ideas and institutions upon which liberal civilisation is founded. If these suppositions prove false, if members of a community lack aptitude for freedom, or prefer to it a discipline imposed from above, or revel in the ease of unthinking obedience to autocratic command, liberty ceases to be justified of her children.

* * *

Judged by this standard neither Fascist Italy nor Hitlerite Germany can be looked upon as liberal. In fact, both of them scornfully repudiate the name. Both, too, have adopted in its place an idea of "leadership" that is indistinguishable from dictatorship, and both conceive the State as "totalitarian." This term was, I believe, first used or popularised by Signor Mussolini himself. It means, in effect, that everything must be within the State, nothing outside the State, that there can be no individual rights apart from those which the State may bestow, and no freedom of speech, writing, or public meeting. The theorists of the Italian Fascist totalitarian State have gone so far as to claim that its authority is as divine as the authority of the Roman Church, and that, just

as the Church rules by Divine right in the spiritual sphere, so the State rules by Divine right in the temporal sphere. A corollary, sometimes expressed but more often tacit, is that the Totalitarian State, both Fascist and Nazi, is itself identical with the Fascist or Nazi party which alone controls and works the State machinery, and that the party is itself controlled by a single "Duce" or "Führer," that is to say, "Leader." In other words, the notion of the Totalitarian State is a modern Mussolinian and Hitlerite version of Louis XIV's famous dictum: "L'Etat c'est moi"—"I am the State."

An enlightening description of what is going on in Germany has recently been published in this country by a well-known German writer, Herr Friedrich Sieburg, who has become whole-heartedly "totalitarian." His testimony is the more interesting because his best-known book, *Is God a Frenchman?* showed him to be by no means blind to the virtues of Western liberal civilisation. Now, in a prefatory letter to the publisher of his new volume, *Germany: My Country*, he writes:—

What is happening in Germany today? The political spirit is taking possession of the whole people. The State is becoming total and is embracing

all those private spheres in which human existence had hitherto detached itself from the State and allowed itself a certain degree of neutrality. This neutrality, which to liberally-minded peoples seems the chief and essential condition for the noble blessings of private life and their enjoyment, is repudiated in Germany as weakness, and often even as deliberate cowardice. There are to be no more private Germans; each is to attain significance only by his service to the State, and to find complete self-fulfilment in this service. Thus, to express it in more emphatic terms, there are to be no more mere human beings in Germany but only Germans. . . . Germany was living in a sort of Babylonian captivity, in spiritual distress, and moral despair: she was languishing beneath a sort of evil spell, but none of her leaders could find the magic formula with which to unbind the spell. Adolf Hitler found it, and, however the world may judge his qualities as a statesman, it cannot refuse him credit for this prophetic quality. . . .

I know that many nations desire the downfall of Adolf Hitler and a speedy conclusion of the Third Empire. But what would be proved if this desire were actually fulfilled? Nothing! A policy would have changed, but the nationalistic character which the German people have acquired would remain, and would probably develop and propagate itself throughout the world. Just because I do not belong to the National Socialist Party and cannot claim to be a prophet of the prophet Hitler, I know that what is happening in Germany today is more than the

triumph of a party. Nationalism is, consciously or unconsciously, saturating the life of every individual German, saturating his every thought and every emotion, and revealing itself in the whole conduct of his life. . . . Our youth is trying to extricate itself from the general world despair, for it is recovering its faith in Germany. Because the victory of National Socialism was so complete, and the vanquished offered so feeble a resistance, it has frequently been declared in foreign countries that the Germans have no moral courage. No notion could be more mistaken. . . . True, the victors were often cruel, and many submitted only grudgingly, but it would be untrue to maintain that the Third Empire secured its sway by dint of sheer violence. It was raised to supremacy by the force of a few great ideas from which not a single German could dissociate himself. Anyone who wanted to live *in* Germany, *with* Germany, and *through* Germany, was obliged to submit to the nation and to adapt himself to the total State. . . . If some of the critical years of my life had not been lived *before* the War, that is to say, in the old days of liberalism, I might have been incapable of taking the unprejudiced view of my own country which this book demands. But since I know what blessings Germany is voluntarily renouncing and upon what treasures she is defiantly turning her back, I can also gauge the grandeur and daring of her march into the future.

* * *

Without affirming that those are wrong who compare the daring march of Germany to the

march of the Gadarene swine, I am glad to be able to cite this passage because it sums up in a way by no means hostile to Hitlerism many of the conclusions I have reached independently. I shall not therefore labour the points which Herr Sieburg so clearly makes. I am, however, disposed to question both the soundness of the totalitarian concept and its essentially German character, though German it certainly is in philosophical origin. The German philosopher, Hegel, was at least its grandparent—as of much else. Did not Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the joint authors of the Marxist Bible, *Capital*, draw largely upon him for their inspiration? Was not the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which Marx and Engels set up, the foundation of the Russian Bolshevist “totalitarian” State and of its peculiar political technique which, as Mussolini has confessed to the well-known German writer, Herr Emil Ludwig, Italian Fascism took over and adapted? And did not Georges Sorel, the French apostle of syndicalism, to whom Mussolini’s acknowledged debt is heavy, go back through the thickets of Marxist Socialism to Hegel himself so as to drink deep draughts of wisdom from the original spring?

Allies, her Government had entered the War on the basis of a hard bargain for territorial and strategic gains, a bargain so ill-conceived that its terms were bound to be detrimental to the higher interests of Italy in the event of complete victory. Thus for Italy the War was, at least in the eyes of her Government, rather a war for national advantage than for a common cause. Indeed, the Italian Press was always instructed to distinguish between "Our War" and "the War of the Allies," until disaster befell Italian arms at Caporetto in October 1917. Then, for a time, some members of the Italian Government perceived how great an interest—moral, political, and economic—Italy might have in forsaking the narrow basis on which she had begun the war, in identifying herself with the loftier Allied aims, and in becoming the chief liberator and warden of the subject Hapsburg peoples.

But no sooner had victory crowned the Allied arms than Italy reverted to the narrow conception of her territorial interests, insistence on which made her policy a serious embarrassment to the other Allied and Associated Governments at the Paris Peace Conference. Over her claims a breach between the Supreme Allied Council and Italy actually occurred. In support of its

claims the Italian Government and its Press whipped up national excitement to fever heat; and when they could not be fully satisfied, the belief spread, and was deliberately encouraged, that Italy had been betrayed and robbed of her good right by envious and niggardly partners. Her mood could hardly have been more depressed had she been actually defeated; and, in proportion as the economic and financial distress of the post-war years came to be felt, depression gave way to a sort of revolutionary despair.

As a result, Communism made rapid headway alongside of more moderate forms of Socialism. In the late summer of 1920, peasants began to seize the land, and Socialist or Communist workmen the factories in northern Italy. Mussolini, who, as a revolutionary syndicalist, had begun to organise a Fascist group in 1919, offered the help of his Black Shirts to the workmen who were holding the factories against the owners. The offer was rejected, and he presently transferred it to the Government, which employed him in 1921 as a castigator of Communists and Socialists. His men were armed by the Italian General Staff. Before then, in the autumn of 1920, the danger of Communist or Socialist revolution had dis-

appeared, as Mussolini truthfully recognised in his own organ in July 1921. But the Italian middle and upper classes had been thoroughly frightened; and it is quite accurate, as Mussolini himself candidly admitted not long ago to an English friend who questioned him on this point, that, though there was no danger of a Communist revolution in Italy after the autumn of 1920, he, to use his own words, "climbed into power on the shoulders of those who believed that there was."

The spirit in which Mussolini and his Fascists, after their so-called "March on Rome" in October 1922, set about the organisation of their Totalitarian State was so similar to that of Hitler and his Brown Shirts—who, indeed, have taken Mussolini and the Italian Fascists for models—as to explain why the phenomena of Fascism and Nazism should be so closely akin. In both instances fierce appeals were made to national pride. In both preparation for war was described as the supreme national duty. In both, martial discipline and training in the use of arms were put in the forefront of patriotic effort. For confirmation one needs only to turn to Mussolini's own article on "Fascism," written by him in October 1932 for the Great Fascist Encyclopaedia and pub-

lished afterwards as a separate volume. He says:—

First of all, as far as the general future and development of humanity are concerned, and apart from any consideration of present policy, Fascism does not believe either in the possibility or in the utility of perpetual peace. It therefore disavows the principle of pacifism which counsels a renunciation of struggle and a feeling of cowardice in regard to sacrifice. War alone brings all human energies to their highest tension and stamps the mark of nobility on those peoples which have the courage to face it. All other ordeals are but substitutes which never place a man face to face with himself in the alternative of life and death. Hence a doctrine that is based upon the premise of peace is foreign to Fascism.

It is in accordance with this outlook that youthful Fascists should have been taught to sing:—

“The dagger, the dagger we wear
Is of steel, of tempered steel,
The German, the German has felt it,
It, too, the Frenchman shall feel.”

And it is in keeping with this spirit that the gift recently made, with all solemnity, by an Italian representative in Germany to Herr Hitler's chief lieutenant should have been a “Dagger of Honour.”

* * *

The German counterpart of Italian Fascism breathes a like spirit. A typical expression of the mood of Nazi youth was reproduced in *The Times* of October 31, 1933, from a Munich newspaper which called it "A Document of the New Youth Spirit." It was the report of a speech delivered at the unveiling in Westphalia of a war memorial in the form of a statue of the Archangel Michael. The Nazi Youth leader hailed the supreme Archangel of the ancient Jews as the protector of the "Reich of the Germans" and also of Herr Hitler, and went on to extol sanguinary sacrifices, bloodshed, and death. His harangue ended, textually, as follows:—

Here we will not speak the warm words of peace, the words Home and Fatherland. Our words are spoken in the face of the awful summons of war. Youths, your hands are now raised in an oath before this monument which is erected to the sublimity of bloodshed—and Michael is the Angel of Death—and you are swearing that your lives belong to the Reich and your blood to the Leader.

For the sake of comparison let me quote the now well-known passage from the school manual on "Military Science" written not long ago by Professor Ewald Banse, one of the professors of Military Science recently ap-

pointed to German universities. Though this manual has now been withdrawn, because it has been "misinterpreted" abroad, no apology is needed for referring to it, since neither it nor another typical work by this learned gentleman would have been spontaneously disavowed. The passage runs:—

We must take our fate in our own hands and begin at last to prepare vigorously for war. Nobody capable of thought can doubt that war stands between happiness in the German future and our present misery. But nowadays war is no longer the fresh and merry war of old, with music and banners, triumph and honours. War today is a bloody fight for annihilation; it is destruction. It is gas, tanks, the horrors of attack by air, penury and famine, agitation and lies, renunciation and sacrifice.

A people can pass through these trials and win the war if every individual member of it is deeply convinced that his life belongs not to him but to the State and to the State alone.

Note the refrain, inseparable from all advocacy of the Totalitarian State, that every individual's life "belongs not to him but to the State and to the State alone." What sort of a State is the Third Reich, or Empire, to be? Herr Gottfried Feder, the speaker who so deeply impressed Hitler in 1919 and now holds high official rank, makes answer in a work en-

titled *The German State*. "The German Reich," he says, "is the home of the Germans. Its political principle is the formation of a homogeneous national State, embracing all of German race. It involves the dismissal of Jews and non-Germans from all responsible positions in public life. None but Germans in communion with the spirit and destiny of Germany may exercise citizen rights. The nation must be made efficient by permitting every free German to serve and to bear arms in a national army under the command of a highly-trained corps of professional officers. The form of State most suitable to the German character is sovereign control united in a central personal power. The creation of a solid national State, embracing all branches of the German race, means that 'all of German blood, whether living under French, Danish, Polish, Czech, or Italian sovereignty, shall be united in a German Reich. . . . We claim all the Germans in Czechoslovak Germany, Alsace-Lorraine, Poland, and the League Colony of Austria which succeeded to the old Austria. This demand, however, expressly excludes any tendency towards imperialism; and it is a simple and natural demand which any strong nationality puts forward as its natural requirement.' " Herr

Gottfried Feder concludes: "National Socialism is a theory of the world, standing in sharp opposition to the present-day world of capitalism and its Marxist and middle-class satellites. Our life is a struggle in the service of this mighty idea, a struggle for a new Germany. We national Socialists wave our storm banner before the world. Ever young, shining and glittering in the sun, rises the Swastika, the Hooked Cross, the symbol of reawakening life."

This programme holds out pleasing prospects for those States which labour under the misfortune of harbouring many citizens of German or, for that matter, of Germanic blood. If it be thought that the programme should not be taken seriously, it must be remembered that, during the past six months, all such States have been perturbed by Nazi agitation and have been obliged to defend themselves against it. The case of Austria is notorious. Less known are those of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, German Switzerland, Sweden, Holland, and Belgian Flanders. French Flanders, including Calais (written Kales), has hitherto been comparatively untroubled, but Holland and Denmark have been obliged to expel German Nazi agitators from their soil. The central idea of the Third Reich is not so much to attack these

various "Germanic" regions outside the borders of Germany as to organise in them Nazi movements, under approved leadership and on the German model, so that, when these movements have grown strong enough, they may demand the inclusion of those regions in the community of Germanic peoples, or *Volksgemeinschaft*, of the Third German Reich and cultivate under the aegis of the Swastika its *Volkstum*, or community of Germanic blood.



The aims of the Hitlerite Third Empire are clear enough to all who have followed Nazi propaganda in Germany and abroad. No less clear are the methods by which they are to be attained. On this score Nazi attempts to destroy the independence of Austria, by agitation and murderous crime, and to cause trouble in other neighbouring countries, leave no room for doubt. In Austria and elsewhere firm resistance has been and is being offered, and even Signor Mussolini has felt obliged to admonish the German Nazis for excess of zeal. Yet many observers outside Germany have wondered why there should have been so little resistance to Hitlerism in Germany by Germans, and why the Communist, Socialist, Liberal, Roman Catholic

and National parties, to say nothing of the German Trade Unions, should so easily have been swept away or "assimilated." Herr Friedrich Sieburg, whose view I have cited, suggests one answer. Another is to be found in the work of a competent American eye-witness, Professor Calvin B. Hoover, author of a well-known study upon *The Economic Life of Soviet Russia*, who published last autumn a calm analysis of Hitlerism in a book entitled *Germany Enters the Third Reich*.

Professor Hoover attributes the collapse of all resistance simply to terror. "It was a fascinating though fearful thing," he writes, "to observe [in Germany] the growth of this atmosphere of terror." He had, he says, previously had the experience of living in a land [Russia] where terror was well established and a normal part of life; but in Germany he was to see terror develop and lay its hand on men. Terror, Professor Hoover continues, consumes the characters of men, and one of the commonest of human reactions to it is the attempt to save one's soul from conscious submission to force by trying to identify oneself in some way with the power which exercises the terror. Thus the German Nationalists attempted to build a bridge between themselves

and Nazism by saying that, after all, it was strongly Nationalist; and Socialists and even Communists tried to build a bridge for their own consciences by telling themselves that, after all, Nazism, or National Socialism, was Socialist. Professor Hoover adds:—

It is difficult indeed for one living in a country in which the theory that one cannot be deprived of life or liberty without due process of law usually holds good, to understand the position of men who live under terror. Thus astonishment has been expressed that hardly a voice was raised in Germany against the acts of violence which occurred. How could a voice be raised so that it would be heard? No newspaper would or could have printed such a protest. No man could have made such a statement in a public meeting without being interrupted, before he could have completed a dozen sentences, and subjected at once to the extremes of physical violence. If he protested, even in private conversation, he was in danger of being denounced, and he would be fortunate if all that happened to him was to receive the legal penalty for spreading "atrocious propaganda." Just as likely would be a line in the Press that Herr So-and-So had been arrested for spreading atrocious propaganda and "had been shot while trying to escape" or "had committed suicide in his cell." Such notices in the Press were frequent. (Thus the issue of the *Münchener Zeitung* of April 15th and 16th contains notices of three such "suicides"). Martyrdom may have a certain appeal if accom-

THE TOTALITARIAN STATE

panied by court trials, with attendant publicity from the sympathetic and liberal Press, but it is quite another thing when it may take the form of summary anonymous "justice" from a Storm Detachment which drags the "martyr" out of bed at three in the morning.

Terror of this sort is certainly effective. . . . Terror of this sort may be the negation of civilisation. It may be that in the long run it destroys the individuals who wield it. But for a very long time it is an all-powerful weapon against which the man of honour who is subjected to it is singularly defenceless.

* * *

Now terror is systematic intolerance in action, and Nazi terror is thoroughly consistent with Nazi doctrine. Of the doctrine a fair illustration is furnished by proceedings, on July 17, 1933, at Weimar, once the home of Goethe, where the District Congress of the Nazi Party in Thuringia was held. Herr Hess, Hitler's personal lieutenant and deputy Party Leader, took part in it, as did the Nazi Lord Lieutenant for Thuringia, Herr Sauckel, and Prince Augustus William of Hohenzollern, fourth son of the ex-Emperor William II. On behalf of the Nazi Government Herr Sauckel said: "I order you henceforth to be intolerant of everything else. For the future there must be in Thuringia only

one political faith, the faith and the idea of National Socialism." The Nazis, he added, derived the right to be intolerant from the necessity of united thought and deed throughout the whole nation. There must be no more discussion of things that bear upon the life and the existence of the people; and everybody who should dare to doubt the rightness of the National Socialist outlook must be branded as a traitor.

On the same day Herr Hitler addressed his Storm Troops at Erfurt in the presence of the Hungarian Prime Minister, Dr. Gömbös, and of the Nazi Home Secretary, Dr. Frick. We shall, declared Herr Hitler, educate the youth of Germany to become what we intend it to be. If there should still be out-of-date beings who think they cannot adapt themselves "we shall take their children from them and train them to be what the German people needs."

This training, in which "military sport" and field exercises play a large part, is not entrusted to the schools and universities alone. Wireless appeals, the cinema, and the Press take an active part in it. The Press and the profession of journalism have been regulated by a new law which turns journalists into Government officials and propaganda agents under the

control of Dr. Goebbels, the Minister of Propaganda, whom the law empowers to deprive, at his will and pleasure, anybody of the right to practise as a journalist. It goes without saying that no German citizen can write for the Press unless he be of "Aryan" descent and be not married to a person of "non-Aryan" descent. The law defines a person of "Aryan" descent as one whose parents and grandparents are all "Aryan." A single "non-Aryan" parent or grandparent is enough to deprive a person of "Aryan" status.

How Dr. Goebbels is using the German Press for Nazi purposes may be gathered from his own description of the way in which the Press shall mould German opinion into a compact and undissenting mass, solidly supporting the Government in all their acts. The Government, he said, foresaw that the Press, through the activity of the Propaganda Ministry, "would develop into a piano upon which it could play." Active propaganda would be governed by the principles of simplicity, weight, and concentration, and the most modern methods would be used, including the theatre and the film. By popular instruction he hoped "to reach the point where the whole nation would think

HITLER : WHENCE AND WHITHER
unitedly and at which there would be only one public opinion."

This programme has been vigorously carried out. The way in which "public opinion" in the Third Reich and under the Totalitarian State is being formed may be judged from any recent issue of *World-Radio*. The programme of German wireless talks is one long series of military and war-like harangues, as though its aim were to convince the German people that war is not only inevitable but is imminent and, indeed, desirable. Two English listeners described in *The Times* of October 9, 1933, an official German broadcast they had heard in this country during the "military hour" on the German wireless. "The speaker," they said, "was an East Prussian, and his barking voice was that of a Prussian drill sergeant on the barrack square. From beginning to end his speech was a fierce command to German youth and manhood to prepare for war. . . . Wherever his German listeners were, whatever they were doing, in every thought and action, in school and study, in office and workshop, in sport and pastime there was to be but one aim and one ideal—preparation for war, for the coming war. The speaker even particularised; all pilots of aeroplanes

were to learn how and where to drop bombs.”

* * *

What lies behind all this noise and drum-beating? Has Hitlerism which, in the economic sphere, put forward a programme strongly tinged with anti-capitalism, not to say Communism, any definite aims in the sphere of foreign policy? Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf*, outlines the general objects of a German foreign policy; and Herr Rosenberg, a Baltic German, Chief of the Foreign Department of the Nazi Party, has declared them still more emphatically in his book *The Future Path of a German Foreign Policy*. I have, reluctantly, been driven to the conclusion that there exists a definite Nazi foreign policy, and that it must be taken very seriously. In this respect the view of so careful an observer as Professor Calvin Hoover bears out my own. It is not too much to say, he writes, that the creation of the Third Reich has completely altered the status of international politics in Europe. The future of Europe can no longer be conceived as based upon the Versailles Treaty, the Locarno Agreements, and the Kellogg Peace Pact. The nations of Europe are confronted by a new

force which regards with hatred and contempt the entire series of international agreements upon which the present order in Europe is built up. National Socialists believe that war is not only an inevitable part of the lives of nations and of men, but that it is a desirable institution for their development. The genius of the German race is expressed in the superiority of its warriors on the field of battle. War affords an opportunity for the display of the noblest of human virtues.

To this extent, Professor Hoover goes on, National Socialism builds directly upon the Prussian tradition, and it should be understood that all this is to a large extent independent of the particular situation in which Germany was placed by the Versailles Treaty. If there were no Versailles Treaty the National Socialist Party might never have come into power; but its belief in the healthfulness of war is quite independent of any particular international situation. The normal life of the German nation is to be that of constant preparation for conflicts which are bound to arise in the fulfilment of German destiny. It is necessary to realise that the Nazis live in a totally different mental world from that of the statesmen of countries which are still under the liberal,

capitalistic, parliamentary system. They believe that the mission of Germany is to save European civilisation by Nordifying it. They see Germany standing as the bulwark of Europe against the spread of Asiatic influences. Her task involves the acquisition of new territory in Europe to support an increasing Nordic population.

This, indeed, is Hitler's own doctrine. As he says in *Mein Kampf*, the only sound policy for Germany before the War would have been to win new land in Europe itself, at the expense of Russia, by marching eastwards along the old road of the Teutonic Knights. If we speak of land in Europe today, Hitler adds, we can only think in the first instance of Russia and her border States. "Our task, the mission of the National Socialist movement," he goes on, "is to bring our own nation to a political view which will not see its future goal attained in an intoxicating crusade, after the fashion of Alexander the Great, but much more in the industrious work of the German plough for which the sword has only to provide the soil."

When the sword has provided this soil, and the Third Reich stands erect, Hitler declares that the political Testament of the German nation must read:—

Never allow two continental Powers in Europe to arise. Look upon every attempt to organise a second military Power on the frontiers of Germany, even though it be only in the form of a State susceptible of military development, as an attack upon Germany, and think it not alone a right but a duty to prevent such a State from arising, or to smash it if it has arisen, by every means, including armed force. Have a care that the strength of our people should be founded not upon colonies but upon the soil of the European home. Never deem the Reich assured if it cannot give all the offspring of our people a bit of land of their own for centuries to come. Never forget that the holiest right in this world is the right to the soil which one may till for oneself, and that the holiest sacrifice is the blood shed for this soil.

By the ordinance which makes *Mein Kampf* the Bible of the Third Reich, this "Testament" has now become an injunction to the German people. Yet, as Professor Hoover says, some may "believe that the fantastic quality of such ideas will prevent them from ever becoming the basis of an actual foreign policy for Germany." Would such a belief be warranted? If it be accepted, he adds, "it is hard to escape an uneasy feeling that one is allowing hope to influence reason." Hitler, it is true, never wearies in declaring his love of peace. But, again and again, he has proved that he never hesitates to give almost any assurance to anyone

whenever it has seemed necessary to win a difficult position or to gain time. Before his famous *Putsch* (or armed rising) at Munich in 1923, he assured General von Lossow, the army commander in Bavaria, that he would never attempt a *Putsch*. In July 1932 he promised support to the von Papen Government in case the Nazis should fail to get a majority. They failed—and Hitler acted otherwise. When he was made Chancellor in January last year and formed a coalition with the Nationalists, Hitler convinced them that his policy would not be drastic. To their cost the Nationalists soon learned the contrary. Hitler has always claimed that the people who said that he had promised this or that had misunderstood him. Professor Hoover observes drily: "It may be that this is so, for Hitler has hardly an equal in his skill in inducing people to deceive themselves."

The key to Hitler's tactics may lie in his views upon the nature of good propaganda. The essence of effective propaganda, he insists, is to repeat, over and over again, that portion of the truth which one desires to be believed. Thus Hitler is able to reconcile a warlike philosophy, the military training of German youth, and feverish rearmament, with constant asseverations of peaceful intent. The assevera-

ER: WHENCE AND WHITHER?

ted attention here, "Professor Banse's seem to strike you as new, but I and inds of my fellow-students in Ger-High Schools and Universities have them drummed into our heads for years

essor Banse's *Territory and People in the War* is, indeed, typical of the Nazi k. Its sub-title, *Thoughts upon a Doctrinal Defence*, is illustrated by a number os, one of which, No. 8, shows how Great a may be invaded. This map assumes ie whole of the Dutch and Belgian coasts ready controlled by or embodied in the Empire and would serve as German for the invasion of England. The East n peninsula—Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex Banse explains, could easily be taken ld by an invading force. When this had lone, a second and subsidiary invasion start from the Irish Free State and strike rpool, the industrial Midlands, and also Clyde. The significance of the map is in two chapters on England and the ter of her people (pages 252–263) in the map is expressly referred to; and lowing attractive passage occurs on 63:—

It is very important to judge English popular character in the event of an enemy invasion. The people, to a man, would certainly rush to arms, and would allow themselves to be mown down in heroic tenacity in front of the Ouse line, or the chalk and jurassian heights, before giving ground step by step. But it is a question whether this people would stand the test of hunger. For centuries, bodily comforts have sorely spoiled them, and they would hardly bear real privations (which during the Great War they never knew, despite rationing). A part of the people would stand even this out of patriotism, but another part would give up the game—which it would no longer feel to be a game—sooner. We confess that it is charming to imagine and to portray the downfall of this proud and secure people at some future time, a people which will have to obey foreign lords in a country unconquered since 1066, or will have to renounce its lucrative colonial empire. Every Englishman and Englishwoman would regard these sentences as a monstrosity, indeed a blasphemy, if they ever came to know of them.

Other parts of this book hold out prospects equally pleasing to Denmark, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland (it insists, for instance, that the only way to rid the world of the Polish question will be to partition Poland once again), Switzerland, and, of course, France. German Switzerland and German France (French Flanders, Alsace and Lorraine), German Belgium (Flanders, Brabant, Eupen, Malmédy), Luxem-

burg, and Holland with the Dutch colonial empire, are likewise to be brought into the Third German Reich.

* * *

This scheme is not more fantastic than are the ideas from which Hitlerism itself has sprung—the belief in the God-given superiority of a non-existent “Aryan” race, and in its right to take the land of other races and to rule over them in virtue of this innate superiority. The support of England or, at least, her passive acquiescence, may or may not be indispensable to the building up of the Third Empire territorially; but from Hitler’s own book it is abundantly clear that he looks upon France as the permanent and relentless enemy of the German nation. No less clear is it that England is to be wooed, or otherwise persuaded, for the express purpose of facilitating the overthrow of France. He writes: “I believe that there would be a good chance of success if we manage first to isolate France, so that the second struggle shall not be one of Germany against the world but a defence of Germany against France who is disturbing German peace and that of the world also. Not until this is fully understood in Germany, so that the German

nation's will to live is no longer wasted in passive defence but is gathered up for a final settlement with France, shall we be able to bring the eternal and fruitless struggle with that country to a decision."

Thus we come to what is, in terms of Nazi foreign policy, the provisional, though by no means final, conclusion of the whole matter. England must be won over to the German side so as to isolate France or, alternatively (in the view of Herr von Papen), France must be won over and offered a German alliance in order to isolate England. It is the old theme with which students of German diplomacy during the past thirty years are only too familiar; and English blindness to its implications was not least among the immediate causes of the Great War, as the Austro-Hungarian Documents sufficiently show. One of those Documents alone (No. 9966) is enough to destroy the pretension, which Hitler never tires of repeating, that Germany was wholly innocent of having willed or let loose the Great War. It, in conjunction with the posthumous papers of Dr. Viktor Naumann, shows that the German Foreign Office sent Dr. Naumann to Vienna on June 27, 1914, with a mission to inform the Austro-Hungarian Government that, in view

of the Anglo-German agreement, just concluded, upon Africa and the Portuguese colonies, and the visit of the British Fleet to Kiel, "people in Berlin" believed it certain that "England would not intervene in a European war." Therefore, added Dr. Naumann, the German Foreign Office, and not only German military and naval circles, were by no means so opposed to the idea of a preventive war as they had been a year before.

It is significant that Dr. Naumann should have reached Vienna in discharge of this mission on June 27, 1914, that is to say, the day *before* the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his Consort at Sarajevo. Thus the Sarajevo crime played no part in the German belief that a "preventive war" would be opportune because Great Britain was certain not to intervene in it. On account of the turmoil caused by the Sarajevo crime, Dr. Naumann could not deliver his message until July 1st. Then—as is shown in the "very secret" memorandum written by an important Austrian official, Count Hoyos, on that day to the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister—the German emissary was quick to argue that "after the bloody deed of Sarajevo the very existence of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was in

question, and that it could not allow this crime to go unpunished but must destroy Serbia."

Sir Edward Grey and the British Government cannot have guessed how Germany had taken advantage of their good faith and their desire to come to an understanding with her by arguing that, for these reasons, Great Britain was certain to leave Germany and Austria-Hungary a free hand in a "preventive" European war. They believed that Germany was bent on peace, and took the asseverations of the German Imperial Government to this effect at their face value. Herr Hitler's present asseverations of peaceful intent are worth no more than were the assurances then given. And today there is an added reason for constant thought and unwearying vigilance upon the prospects which Hitlerite policy, in all its aspects, opens up. The Nazi system in Germany, like the Italian Fascist system—its predecessor and exemplar in the establishment of the Totalitarian State—is a standing denial of what we mean by liberal civilisation. This civilisation, with its care for individual freedom of thought, word, and deed, under laws duly made by representative assemblies, is today upheld by only two of the major nations in Western Europe—Great Britain and France. United in

purpose and aim, these two nations may stand, and, in standing together, may yet save Europe from the disaster that will surely overwhelm it and them if they suffer themselves to be divided. It may not be too late to safeguard peace by a resolute policy based on the whole Covenant of the League of Nations and on the principles of the Kellogg Pact. Such a policy would be supported by all peoples which still cling to liberal institutions if Great Britain and France firmly proclaim it, stick to it, and show themselves determined to uphold it by every means in their power.

This course might suffice for the present. It cannot, by itself alone, safeguard the future. Like Italian Fascism and other exemplifications of professedly efficient unfreedom, German Nazism is the outcome of a morbid national mood, and of propagandist suggestions working upon mass neurasthenia. It is a thoroughly unhealthy phenomenon. In Western Europe, Great Britain and France have been and are relatively free from this morbid mood, though they are less free from perverse conceptions of democracy which, by running wild in Italy and in Germany, helped to produce a state of mind favourable to the rise of violent totalitarian dictatorship. We should have a care lest we,

too, by harbouring perverse and degenerate conceptions of democracy, betray its sound principles and smooth the path of the enslaver. Democracy is not a system devised to assure the economic or social predominance of any one class. It is, at lowest, a form of mutual assurance against the curtailment of individual rights and liberties, its underlying assumption being that these rights and liberties, thus assured, shall be used in a spirit of self-devotion to the common weal. The practice of true democracy demands personal service and personal sacrifice from those who engage in it. Thus interpreted, democracy is capable of a free efficiency which none of its foes can rival. If it be stoutly and worthily served, it may yet show the world a safer and a saner way out of present troubles than any violent substitute for individual freedom can offer.

To me the issue seems plain. My object is to help in making it plain to others, to bring home to them a sense of its gravity, of its urgency, to suggest where there may be solid ground for their feet, and to shed some light on their path in an hour which they may feel to be one of doubt and gloom, but which is, in very truth, an hour of opportunity for clear-eyed vision and high-hearted resolve.